THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE wonder is that we are all not better preachers than we are, for there comes to us a constant stream of books on preaching, written by masters of that art. Three such books are at the moment before us.

The first, *Biblical Preaching and Biblical Scholarship*, by the Rev. C. K. BARRETT, D.D.,[1] is little more than a pamphlet, but the size of the book is no criterion of its value. Preaching, says Dr. BARRETT, is not entertainment; it is not discourse upon philosophical subjects, or even upon religious subjects; it is not the mere stimulation of feeling, nor even the communicating of an experience; it is not even Bible teaching; it is 'one form of the self-communication of the Word of God.' 'The preacher is not in the pulpit to express himself, to impose himself upon the congregation, but to expose and express the divine truth in Scripture, with as little human interposition as possible.' To do that the preacher must understand Scripture, and therefore 'Scholarship waits upon preaching as its handmaid.'

The most significant part of Dr. BARRETT'S exposition is the place which he attaches to scholarship. Because the Bible is an ancient book, scholarship has certain tasks as the ally of preaching. Its two basic tasks are that it must establish the text of Scripture, and it must master the languages of Scripture. It must examine the background of Scripture, and tell us about the lives and times of the men of the Bible and their neighbours. It must practise literary and historical criticism, never for the purposes of destruction, but always for the purposes of illumination. And it must provide the history of interpretation.

The preacher must at all times exercise two qualities. He must exercise *discipline*. That is to say, he must be willing to make the effort to study conscientiously and meticulously the tools and the equipment which scholarship provides, and he must never lazily allow his own scholarship to rust. He must exercise *honesty*. Dr. BARRETT tells a story of his own father. 'When I have found a text,' his father said to a companion, 'I always begin by studying the context, in order to make sure of its original setting and meaning.' 'When I find a text,' replied the companion, 'I never look up the context for fear it spoils the sermon.' '*That* is dishonesty!'

Dr. BARRETT is himself a meticulous scholar, and here he sets forth the terms of the alliance between scholarship and preaching. A preacher should read this little book—even if sometimes it fills him with shame.

The second of the three books is *The Integrity of Preaching*, by Professor JOHN KNOX.[2] Here is a book which is surgical in its diagnosis and in its honesty. The most valuable thing in this book is its most penetrating analysis of what Biblical preaching is. It is not simply lecturing on background and dealing with Biblical problems. It is far more than that. Biblical preaching has four characteristics. (i) It is preaching which 'remains close to the characteristic and essentially Biblical ideas.' These ideas are the transcendence, the holiness, the power, and the sovereignty of God: His demand for ethical righteousness; His judgment upon sin; man's creaturehood, his plight as a sinner; his need of forgiveness and release; the meaning of Christ as the actual coming of God into history; the availability of reconciliation and all that reconciliation means, within the new community of the Spirit, and available upon penitence and faith. (ii) Biblical preaching is centrally concerned with 'the central Biblical event, the event of Christ.' (iii) Biblical preaching is preaching which 'answers to and nourishes the essential life of the Church.' 'Preaching is an ellipse moving about the two foci of the ancient event and the always new life of the Spirit.' (iv) Biblical preaching is preaching in

[1] Epworth Press; 1s. net.

[2] Abingdon Press; $1.75 net.

which the event in a real sense is recurring. The Biblical preacher is not discussing past events. 'In his inspired words the past event is happening again.'

No man can read Dr. KNOX's book and ever be in danger of cheap preaching again, if he takes its prophetic words to heart.

The third book is in some ways the most practical of the three. It is *The Making of the Sermon*, by the Rev. ROBERT J. MCCRACKEN.[1] Its most interesting section is its fairly long analysis of the nine different kinds of preaching.

There is *Expository* preaching. Systematic Biblical exposition saves the preacher from the worst kind of subjectivism, and gives comprehensiveness to his preaching. There is *Ethical* preaching. Let no man despise it. John Wesley was moved to break out: 'I find more profit in sermons on either good tempers or good works, than in what are vulgarly called gospel sermons. That term has now become a mere cant word: I wish none of our society would use it. It has no determinate meaning. Let but a pert, self-sufficient animal, that has neither sense nor grace, bawl out something about Christ, or His blood, or justification by faith, and his hearers cry out: "What a fine gospel sermon!"' The more things change, the more they remain the same! There is *Devotional* preaching. It was John Watson who said towards the end of his life that if he had his ministry to exercise over again, he would preach more comforting sermons. There is *Theological* preaching, which must be wisely done, lest the preacher merit the deacon's verdict on a young preacher: 'Our young man has settled a lot of problems we never heard of, and answered a lot of questions nobody was asking.' There is *Apologetic* preaching, in which A. D. Lindsay's words to ministers should be remembered: 'You are arguing, and you should not argue, you should witness.' There is *Social* preaching, which should never degenerate into vituperation, but which should 'uncover causes and point to cures.' There is *Psychological* preaching which must probe to the motives of the human heart. There is *Evangelical* preaching, the aim of which is to effect a face-to-face meeting with Jesus Christ. There is *Life situation* preaching, which, as Fosdick said, never forgets that there is a problem in nearly every pew.

A man is not responsible for unavoidable ignorance, but he is responsible for neglect of knowledge; and the preacher who neglects the wisdom and the warning of books such as these does so at his peril.

[1] S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net.

'A rejuvenation of theology is not likely to be brought about by the intellectual refinement in which liberal divines excel.' That is a judgment which may provoke agreement among some, and irritation among other readers of this journal. It comes from a lecture by Dr. A. R. VIDLER entitled 'Christianity, Liberalism and Liberality' which is included in a volume recently published—*Essays in Liberality*.[1] He suggests that the term Liberalism should be kept for the nineteenth-century phenomenon which John Morley espoused and John Henry Newman attacked, but which they were sufficiently agreed in defining. Liberalism took many forms, but, uniting them all, there was a sense of the dignity and worth of the individual, and a confidence that progress for the individual demanded more freedom from constraint.

Liberalism, therefore, presupposed the existence of institutions, forces, vested interests which were thwarting man's nature and which must be abolished so that man's native virtue might be released. In the religious sphere Liberalism tended toward criticism of established institutions and orthodoxies and the opening up of new questions: and the issue of the efforts and sacrifices of Liberal divines was a freedom of thought and speech and publication in almost all churches which we are apt to take for granted to-day without acknowledgment of our debt to those who won it for us. On the side of constructive work the theological Liberal was less successful. The Liberal Protestant could dispose of Biblical fundamentalism, the Liberal Catholic could expose the pretensions of ecclesiastical infallibility; but their own efforts at reconstruction were less spiritually substantial than the systems from which they sought emancipation. The prospects for Christian Liberalism are not bright. The Liberal divines are too tolerant and too urbane to constitute a social stratum from which a fundamental renewal of Christianity is likely to proceed. It is not yet possible to say whence a new spring of life may come; but Dr. VIDLER mentions in this connexion the opinion that renewal may come from the other side of the Iron Curtain, and the hope that resides in the apostolic quality of life in some of the younger churches.

Liberalism, then, is dated; but liberality with its adjective liberal (with a small letter) is in a

[1] S.C.M.; 15s. net.

ifferent case. By liberal our author means not a reed or a set of philosophical assumptions but a ame of mind, a quality of character. In his age liberal is the opposite not of conservative ut of fanatical or bigoted. It involves generous idgments, freedom from prejudice, an openness o new ideas and proposals for reform. This is a ame of mind which men, if they have it, tend to se as they grow old, yet young men often lack it. is, moreover, a frame of mind which is not more ommon among adherents of Liberalism and other stensibly progressive creeds than it is among herents of systems professedly conservative. e liberal temper is not peculiarly Christian: ncient Greece and China knew it; yet it is a irtue which the Christian gospel ought to deepen d perfect. In the Old Testament it appears ore in the Wisdom literature than in the prophets, nd it is more conspicuous in Fathers of the hurch like Clement of Alexandria and Origen han in the New Testament.

It would seem that great truths have first to be oldly proclaimed in a raw and rugged manner, nd that only later comes the time for qualifying, efining, and systematizing them. What is needed ow, says Dr. VIDLER, is a profound and revolu- ionary rediscovery of theological truth, which is kely to be very unrefined in its first manifesta- ions. The liberal-minded may at first be shocked; ut there will be work ahead for them to do, for is at the later stage that men of liberal temper nake their best contribution. It is their task to e critical of prevalent moods and hidden assump- ions and dominant cliques. Such criticism is kely to be both humbling and reconciling in the ng run, for its effect is to show that no party or chool of thought is ever so right as its protagonists re inclined to believe. Valuable, however, as his critical function may be, it does not lead to reat works of construction or great decisions. he rôle of the liberal is a salutary antiseptic one, ut it is a subordinate one. It is not the Erasmuses ut the Luthers who change the course of history. Here Dr. VIDLER quotes with approval from . S. Oliver—'In the supreme events, it is not fficient to be reasonably persuaded; the man ho is to succeed must be unreasonably confident.' hat is what the liberal as such is not.

It would appear, then, that in the Church there need for both types—the unreasonably confident ho are likely to serve as great preachers, evange- sts, missionaries and pioneers, and also the stringently critical who seek to comprehend, riticize and refine. In so doing they show that hristians have much more in common, both of truth and error, than the unreasonably confident admit. Yet must these two types continue to be separate? Must we always choose between a Luther and an Erasmus? May it not be within the power of the Holy Spirit to knit together in the same person both the unshakeable conviction of the prophet and the cleansing scepticism of the wise man? Would that we could see 'the man who is tolerant, not because he regards all opinions as doubtful, but because he knows that God alone is true—the man who is ready to learn from all men, not because he has no creed of his own, but because his creed assures him that God is teaching and chastening all men—the man who has plumbed the meaning for the human intellect of the great New Testament word about having nothing and yet possessing all things—the man who can at once rigorously doubt and sincerely believe—in short the man who has discovered that it is not only the sinner but the doubter who is justified by faith.'

In the *Canadian Journal of Theology*, III. i. [January 1957] Professor J. M. SHAW has an interesting essay on 'The Christian Interpretation of History.' Starting with the ethnic view of history as cyclical, he goes on to the Old Testament view which finds history meaningful for it leads to a climax, and then to the New Testament view which, he points out, is not properly described as linear. The distinctive feature of the Christian view is that the climax has already come in Christ. The linear view is rather to be associated with humanistic evolutionary thinking. For this last the Christian view is vitiated by the 'scandal of particularity'—the affirmation that one individual possesses an absolute and final value, and that the subsequent historical development is to be thought of less as an evolution than as a continual dying and rising again into newness of life.

The essay concludes with some consideration of the demand of Bultmann and others for the demythologizing of the Biblical story of redemption. On this Professor SHAW has two comments. First, Bultmann does not sufficiently recognize that the language of spiritual truth must be that of myth and symbol, not that of rational concepts. Second and more important, Bultmann, in Professor SHAW's judgment, does less than justice to the New Testament and to the witness of Christian history and experience with its ever repeated corroboration of the essential abiding miracle of the living Christ's working, expressed in the Pauline statement that 'if any one is in Christ he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come.'

Easter: and Middleton Murry's 'Love, Freedom and Society'

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.Lit., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's

Try to imagine the Christian year without Easter. Suppose that there was nothing after Good Friday and that Jesus dying on the Cross was the final word. In other words, imagine Christianity without the Resurrection. What would be left?

We know St. Paul's answer—nothing. 'If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, your faith is also vain.' But the question is being asked seriously now by those who see that civilization is in peril and that some spiritual conviction is needed to sustain it. They think that belief in God and the supernatural has become impossible for many, and they urge that we may drop them, but still keep the moral inspiration, preserve, as they would say, the 'essence of Christianity.'

Middleton Murry's book, *Love, Freedom and Society*, is an outstanding example of this point of view. It is, alas, the final production of that fertile and seeking mind, for he died on the day of its publication. His thoughts, at the end, were concentrated on the question, Can freedom survive in the civilization of the future?

His reflections on this urgent problem centre upon three convictions.

(1) There is a vital need for spiritual power which will inspire and extend respect for personality, for without this freedom cannot exist. But respect for the personality of others is a kind of love and cannot persist as a practical policy of action unless it is nourished by love. Freedom cannot survive if love ceases to be a real motive in the souls of a large proportion of the human race.

(2) In the Western world the source of love has been mainly the Christian faith. Even in its deepest corruption and aberration, the Church has summoned men to contemplate the Cross, and from this contemplation love has taken its rise in many hearts.

(3) We can no longer believe in the doctrines which the Church has woven round the Figure on the Cross. We recognize that the Resurrection was a necessary belief in order that the memory of Jesus should not be lost, but we know now that it was a product of imagination. We know, too, that the God of love in whom Jesus believed was an illusion. He does not exist.

What then? We must regard the Cross and Passion of Jesus as the greatest of all tragedies—as the archetypal tragedy. He is presented to us, in the stark reality of history, as the man who loved without limit and believed that God was with him, that in loving he was serving and revealing God. At the end, he knew that his faith was unfounded. His last words were, 'Why hast thou forsaken me?' There was no resurrection. The tragedy was complete. Murry's final sentence is: 'We know that Jesus lives now in the hearts of individual and mortal men, and only there.'

But we must still contemplate the Cross—as tragedy. Without belief in God, with no hope of a life beyond death, we may contemplate the Man who loved and was defeated and so kindle the flame of love in ourselves.

Many, I believe, to-day have a view of the Passion of our Lord something like this, and Murry's eloquence will no doubt increase the number. A large book would be required to examine his ideas in detail, but they are so important that I venture to suggest some fundamental thoughts on them.

(1) His plan will not work. St. Paul was right when he wrote, and he is still right. Murry writes finely and truly of the flood of love, joy and peace which flowed into the hearts of many harassed persons from the Cross. But how did it flow? Because they believed that the Cross was not tragedy but triumph; that it was an act of the loving God who was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. They believed in the resurrection of the Crucified, and, therefore, they could believe in the love of the Father; they could believe that behind the forbidding appearance of the world was the love of God.

Will it be different now? The plain man asks himself, what is it sensible to do; how to direct his endeavours in this brief existence. He is told, you must love—love all men. But loving is hard and, on the surface, often seems not only hard but absurd. If, indeed, God is love and, therefore, love is at the foundation of existence; if not loving separates us from God, then, and perhaps only then, can the plain man be convinced that to love is reasonable.

(2) We must observe how Middleton Murry treats the evidence. He scarcely mentions it. Certainly he does not consider it. He reaches his

gative conclusion on the basis of a presupposi-
on—or a prejudice. He assumes that miracles
n't happen and that the supernatural is a
gment. In short, he thinks that he knows the
nits of the possible, and they do not include the
esurrection. But what folly this really is!
ere are more things in heaven and earth than
e dreamed of in his philosophy. Surely by this
ne we ought to have learned that the possi-
lities of existence are unlimited from the point
view of the human mind.

(3) His vision of the world is curiously restricted.
e nature of the world, he thinks, precludes the
nception of the love of God. Yet he himself
ites of the 'mystery' of human love. He is
ht. Love was in the world before Jesus was
rn. Somehow unselfish love and pity have
me into that world which seems to him so
different to human values. How did love and
ty arise? Men have seen in them marks of the
vine. They have thought that 'We love
cause He first loved us.' And there are other
nysteries'—beauty, justice and the thirst for
uth. They are realities; they are parts of the
orld and standing evidences that existence has
tentialities which no one can foresee. They are
iding indications of the being and nature of God.
As time goes on, it will become clearer that the choice before us lies between something very like what Murry puts so eloquently and something very like what the Church has believed about the Resurrection. The alternatives are the tragedy of an heroic but deluded prophet or the victory over death of the Son of Man, who not only died but rose again for us.

Neither side will be able to overthrow the other by sheer weight of argument, for both, to a large extent, will depend on faith or presupposition, the one on the negative presupposition which Middleton Murry employs and the other on the positive presupposition of faith in God. We who believe must understand that ours is an act of faith which needs constantly to be renewed. Time and again we shall have to resist the contra-suggestion of the intellectual environment in which we live. Our resurrection faith is a reasonable one which we can defend by evidence and logic, but, at the end, it demands a leap of the will by which we commit ourselves. In Pascal's audacious phrase 'il faut parier'—we must bet on it, we must stake ourselves on it.

'He that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine.' He who lives in the faith of Christ risen shall come to have the evidence in himself and shall pass from faith in the Resurrection to knowing the power of the Resurrection.

Literature

A RETURN TO LITERARY CRITICISM

The appearance of vol. 2 of *The Sources of the noptic Gospels* (Cambridge University Press; s. net), by the late Canon Wilfred L. Knox, D.D., much to be welcomed because of the fertility of suggestions and its independence of treatment, t most of all because it marks a return to the erary criticism of the Gospels. Volume 1 was blished in 1953 and was widely praised for its mpressed erudition, originality, and its critical umen. The same characteristics are to be seen vol. 2. The delay in its appearance is largely e to the necessity of piecing together short tions of the work with editorial modifications d additions where only fragmentary notes sur-ved, and for this difficult task Mr. H. Chadwick, llow of Queens' College, Cambridge, is to be artily congratulated. Volume 1 was concerned th St. Mark's Gospel; vol. 2 is devoted to the dy of the sources used by St. Luke and St. tthew.

In addition to the birth and infancy narratives the two Gospels, the use of the Q tradition by ir authors is carefully studied. Dr. Knox does t doubt that the large amount of material common to these Gospels is drawn from a common source or group of sources, but he points out that the document as reconstructed by Streeter is of a very peculiar character. His main contribution to the problem, which in some respects recalls the views of Schleiermacher, is that behind the Q material short tracts telling of the ministry of Jesus, such as would be required by individual missionaries, have been used by the two Evangelists. Provided that one recognizes that these tracts had already been combined in a common source, there is much to be said for this suggestion.

The sources in Dr. Knox's view are most apparent in Luke in the charge to the disciples, and sections dealing with prayer, miracles, worldly riches, the nationalist peril, banquet sayings, forgiveness, apocalyptic sayings, and parables. Similar tracts are to be detected in Matthew, although here the Evangelist's editorial activity renders their recovery difficult. It is impossible to profit fully from this most interesting discussion without constant reference to the Greek text of the Gospels, and this is how it should be. Dr. Knox is entirely justified in saying that 'the questions of historicity and authenticity cannot be usefully discussed before the closest detective work has been done on the

synoptic sources.' It is to be hoped that after the meagre harvest from form-criticism, typology, and the existentialist treatment of the Gospels has been reaped (or gleaned) students will turn with renewed interest to the neglected fields of Synoptic criticism.

The Epilogue on ' The Problem of Authenticity ' is of particular interest and value. ' Jesus appears in the Synoptic Gospels,' Dr. Knox writes, ' not as proclaiming Himself as the Messiah in some specifiable sense, but as coming with absolute authority to set up the kingdom of God on earth, and, at any rate in the later stages of His ministry, as finding that His purpose can only be fulfilled by His death.' He holds that the term ' Son of Man ' was deliberately chosen by Jesus to force His hearers to ask themselves exactly what His message meant and what the Kingdom of God was intended to be. At the triumphal entry He challenged the bystanders to face the question whether He was the Messiah or not ' by doing it in a way which could call to mind the prophecy of Zechariah,' a view which ' seems perfectly possible when it is remembered how vague the Messianic idea was and the extent to which the period was excited by various Messianic hopes.' Altogether this book is as stimulating as it is provocative and as constructive as it is critical.

VINCENT TAYLOR

INTERPRETING THE OLD TESTAMENT

Many books have been written recently to aid readers to understand the Old Testament and to discern its perennial significance and to help them to find the Word of God in words of men which seem so much to bear witness to human imperfections and error. Among such books *The Two-Edged Sword,* by Father John L. McKenzie, S.J., must take a high place (Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee ; $4.50). He puts Israelite life and thought in the context of related cultures in the ancient Near East to show what it owes and where it differs and, in contrast with modern ideas, to show to what extent these are developments in the light of fuller knowledge and to what extent they are deviations. The result is a book which holds the attention and its clearly-written, forthright style adds to its appeal.

Father McKenzie gathers the discussion of his subject around certain great topics of interest, such as the Word of God, divine revelation, cosmic, human and national origins, kings and prophets, priests and sages, the mystery of iniquity, life and death, and the hope of the future. He speaks frankly both of scholars whose scientific study of the Old Testament seems to give less and less of its meaning and value, and of those who make the Old Testament a spring-board from which to soar into flights of spiritual speculation. He rightly affirms that the Hebrews were not a culturally creative people but in many of the arts and crafts were borrowers from other peoples ; nevertheless, they had a ' peculiar religious genius ' which enabled them to bequeath as a living heritage something much more valuable than the greatness of a material civilization. In a day long before historiography as we know it was born, they were masters of the story and employed it with notable effect. ' We do not meet in the Old Testament systematic, logical constructions of thought ; we meet ideas expressed through creative imagery.'

Sometimes Father McKenzie develops an interesting and fresh point of view. For instance, he does, as many have done before now, emphasize the sexual milieu of the story of the Fall and finds evidence for this line of interpretation in the making of aprons to cover nakedness, in the penalty laid upon woman, and in the part played by the serpent whose significance modern archaeological discoveries have so much clarified ; and he sums up what he has to say in this way : ' The Hebrew story makes the sin of deifying nature—in particular, the forces of fertility—the primeval fault. The whole of Hebrew tradition reflects this conviction that " idolatry," the sin of deifying nature, is essentially opposed to all that the God of Israel was, and all that He taught was good in human life.' In another place, he speaks of man as ' God's viceroy over the visible creation, so that, when man is obedient to the divine will, he communicates to the rest of the world the harmony established by the divine government, but when he rebels, the result is disorder in which the whole of nature is involved.'

There are sayings in the book which one might be inclined to dispute ; for example, the statement that ' even the word of the Lord did not make a man that which he did not really want to be ' does not seem to leave enough room for Jeremiah and the compulsion under which he was laid to go where he would not ; and the statement that ' the Hebrews did not see their history and deduce God's present activity ; they knew Him and were forced to admit His activity ' seems much too unyielding when we think of the influence of the deliverance of the Israelites at the Red Sea upon Israelite thought about God.

But that book with the whole of which we agree we might as well not read. This book is well worth reading and deserves the attention of Protestants and Roman Catholics alike.

JOHN MAUCHLINE

DATING THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Two brochures dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls appeared in February and March this year and can

e discussed together because both contribute to ne question of dating the Scrolls. The one, *The eacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* Tyndale Press; 2s. net) is by Professor F. F. ruce, and the other—the Ethel M. Wood 1957 ecture—*Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea crolls* (Athlone Press; 4s. net), is by Professor H. Rowley. Each carries its own immediate mmendation, and it is hardly necessary to say at the treatment in each is excellent and the notation—the former with a hundred and seven d the latter a hundred and sixty-five notes to irty-six pages in each—is, to say the least, dequate. Apart, however, from the intrinsic nportance of each book, it would be fair to mment that the most noteworthy feature is e wide divergence of the conclusions which are ffered.

Professor Rowley is becoming increasingly con-dent that the early second century B.C. is the nly suitable date for the Teacher of Righteousness nd the emergence of the sect. He allows that not l the Scrolls in their present form belong to ne earliest period, and that Scrolls could have een composed by Sectarians down to the time hen they finally left the caves. But to demon-trate his main thesis he examines the oldest naterial, namely the 'Habakkuk Commentary,' the Zadokite Work' and the 'Battle Scroll' along-ide various Pseudepigrapha, namely, 1 Enoch, he Testaments of the Twelve, some Sibylline racles and the Psalms of Solomon, especially from he point of view of apocalyptic teaching. Having iscussed the probable dates of the latter, and aving assessed, in his inimitable manner, the erdicts of scholars on the point, he proceeds to pply his findings to the Scrolls. For instance, he escribes affinities between the Messianic expecta-ons in the Scrolls and the 'Testaments' (second entury B.C.) which are not present in the Psalms of olomon (first century B.C.), and explains the ivergence as indicating that the former were con-emporary whereas by the time the latter were mposed the sect of the Scrolls had withdrawn om active life in Judaea and retired to its onastery in the wilderness.

Professor Bruce also uses the historical method. e examines allusions in all the relevant literature, amely, the 'Zadokite,' the *pesharim* and the Hymns,' and assesses their validity with a certain mount of reserve because of the schematic rather han 'historical' character of some of the data, and he general vagueness of information relating to the ighteous Teacher. Nevertheless, by dint of mar-alling data about the Wicked Priest, the Man of alsehood and the House of Absalom, and scrutin-ing them against a background of history as pplied by Josephus and the Rabbis, the author finds for the time of Alexander Jannaeus (76 B.C.), *i.e.*, a full century later than Professor Rowley.

Neither scholar would claim that he has uttered the final word in the matter, and it would appear, at least for the time being, that neither can out-argue the other. The fact remains, however, that despite polite caveats the two views are mutually exclusive, because they are based on the same source material. Indeed, it must ever remain so unless an obliging *deus ex machina*, probably in the shape of an unambiguous proper name, were to appear and settle the problem. But does a satis-factory appreciation of the value of the Scrolls ultimately depend on such a solution? In other words, are the teachings of the Scrolls fundamen-tally conditioned by the period and the circum-stances in which they originated? If they are, then much of the literature on the Scrolls is irre-levant; if not, there is a considerable amount of unnecessary ingenuity being practised, because the whole question of sole dependence on the 'historical approach' has again been opened up by these two books.

B. J. ROBERTS

SUBSTITUTION

The book, *Christ in our Place*, by Dr. Paul van Buren (Oliver and Boyd; 10s. 6d. net), is the thesis which gained for its author the degree of D.Theol. from Basel University. The sub-title 'The Sub-stitutionary Character of Calvin's Doctrine of Reconciliation' describes the thesis which is main-tained throughout the three parts into which the book is divided. In the first two parts, headed respectively 'The Incarnation: Christ's Union with Us' and 'The Atonement: Christ in our Place,' the concept of substitution is convincingly presented and Dr. van Buren shows that, whether Calvin treats of Incarnation or Atonement, whether he is using the forensic or the sacrificial framework of thought, the concept of substitution is present and indeed dominates.

However, in the third part 'Incorporation: Union with Christ' the thesis is weaker and in that section which deals with sanctification 'substitu-tion' is made to bear the weight not only of 'us in Christ' but also 'Christ in us' which it does not do very easily. The result is a rather strained chapter in which the word 'substitution' and its deriva-tives occur with great frequency as if the author were still trying to convince himself as well as his readers.

In the section of the chapter headed 'The Body of Christ' in which Dr. van Buren treats of 'The Church as the Body of Christ' the only quotation defining Church is 'There is, he [Calvin] says, no other way of entrance into life except through the

all-too-visible Church.' This leaves the impression that all that is said by Calvin on the Church relates exclusively to the visible Church. Yet, in the portion of the *Institutes* from which some of the references are taken at this point, Calvin himself says ' When in the Creed we profess to believe the Church, reference is made not only to the visible Church of which we are now treating, but also to all the elect of God, including in the number even those who have departed this life ' (Book iv. ch. i. sect. 2).

The book is copiously documented throughout, the references being largely to Calvin's Commentaries and the *Institutes*. Besides these there are references to various of Calvin's great predecessors among the Fathers, showing his relationship to them at different points in his thought.

In his conclusions the author points some lessons for the Church to-day arising from the study—(*a*) to make Christology the central point of our theology and the Incarnation the determining factor in our Christology ; (*b*) ' to see Christ as the normative and sufficient revelation of God ' ; (*c*) not to throw away too quickly the penal substitutionary theory of the Atonement ; (*d*) to understand the Church as the Body of Christ ' by taking it back, as Calvin does, to the person and work of Christ Himself.'

Throughout Dr. van Buren poses questions of Calvin which he feels are raised from Calvin's own thought and these, besides prompting one to attempt answers, rouse a desire to make a closer acquaintance with the original—a course which is strongly recommended by Karl Barth in his introduction to the work. JAMES GREEN

An American scholar, Professor Harold Hulme, has worked for twenty years on the early Stuart period, and he has now issued a massive volume, *The Life of Sir John Eliot* (Allen and Unwin ; 35s. net). Eliot was a Parliamentary leader who attacked the ministers of Charles I. and died in the Tower, a martyr for the cause of freedom of speech in the House of Commons. So far as Eliot is concerned, this looks like a definitive work. It should also make for a clearer view of the development of that opposition to the Crown which in the hands of some of Eliot's colleagues issued in the Civil War.

And Unto Smyrna, by the Rev. S. W. H. Bird, M.A. (James Clarke ; 6s. net), tells a colourful story. It is primarily the story of the Anglican Church in Smyrna from 1636, when the Levant Company appointed the first British chaplain, till the present day. In fact it is much more, for it outlines the long and varied history of one of the most ancient cities of the world. The writer, who is the present British Chaplain at Smyrna, deserves thanks for an interesting and well-written work.

A very useful introduction to the study of the religions of mankind has been provided in *History of Religions* (The Teach Yourself Books), by Professor Emeritus E. O. James, D.Litt., D.D. (English Universities Press ; 7s. 6d. net). The author holds that the best introduction to the subject is ' to secure an overall view of the whole layout of the territory ' before one engages in more detailed study. Beginning with a survey of archaeological and anthropological evidence relating to the Old Stone Age, he goes on to discuss religions in the Ancient Middle East, India, China and Japan, Zoroastrianism and Judaism, the religions of Greece and Rome, Christianity and Islam, and ends with a valuable chapter on different methods of approach to the study of religion. The religions are first treated in relation to the circumstances in which they arose, and then their subsequent development is discussed. That so much has been brought together in so small a space as two hundred and thirty-two pages is a remarkable accomplishment, possible only to a scholar of such wide learning and experience as the author. On p. 73 the phrase *tat tvam asi* is translated as ' That art that,' which should be ' Thou art that.' In the account of Islam there are a few errors in matters of detail, but these do not affect the accuracy of the general treatment. Each chapter is supplied with a useful bibliography, and the interest of the book is enhanced by a large number of illustrations.

Historical Development of the Principle of Toleration in British Life, by Professor Herbert Butterfield, LL.D., D.Lit. (Epworth Press ; 2s. net), is the Robert Waley Cohen Memorial Lecture for 1956. Professor Butterfield points out in a balanced survey that the crucial period in this matter is the Cromwellian era, and he includes a reference to the re-admission of the Jews to England, of which event the tercentenary was celebrated last year. Cromwell was more tolerant than many of his fellow-countrymen, and more tolerant in fact than was consistent with the views he held.

The Epworth Press has just published a new collection of stories for children and young people

y Principal C. J. Davey. Mr. Davey is one of hat small, distinguished number who tell stories, vorthwhile stories, really well. And you can est this by reading 'Why They Pushed the Vestry Down,' quoted this month in 'Virginibus Puerisque.' The title of the collection is *The Golden Arrow* (5s. net, paper covers). There are wenty-five stories. As the 'blurb'—a model of s kind—tells us 'they are set in Korea, the South eas, Africa, the North-West Frontier and, indeed, ll over the world.'

Antidote to Doubt, by the Rev. A. E. Gould Independent Press; 6s. 6d. net), is a little book popular apologetic—not too slick or argumentative, but dealing seriously though simply and onfidently with seven main items in the Apostles' reed. We wish it many readers, for it is calulated to disinfect the minds of its readers from ne poison of secularism.

Between Two Miracles, by Mr. Stuart Craig Independent Press; 6s. net), records impressions f a seven months' tour among the Pacific Islands, ent in the study of the development of the urches there. The first miracle is the marvellous ansformation wrought by the gospel in savage eoples. The second still tarries, though there are gns of its coming. It will be a new day of the pirit which will manifest itself in moral change individual lives and in works of emancipation the deepest levels. This is a lively and fundaentally hopeful book, that does not seek to onceal the faults of peoples still young in the ith.

The Wondrous Cross, by Principal H. F. Lovell ocks (Independent Press; 5s. net), begins with study of the doctrine of the Trinity and so sets ie discussion of the Atonement firmly in the love the triune God. In the twelve chapters which llow all the relevant themes are briefly but xpertly treated: the substance Biblical, the nguage contemporary. The illustrations, never egenerating into anecdotes, are to the point and nderline the truth that the facts of the home are almost necessary commentary on the gospel. his book, brief though it is, could have been ritten only by one who has read widely and has mself looked deeply into the mystery of the lvation of sinners. Its greatest merit is that on ery page it points beyond itself to the Saviour, lping the reader to see the Cross in its, and His, vn light.

The latest volume in the 'World Christian Books' series is *Religious Liberty*, by Professor Giovanni Miegge (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is in two parts. The second deals with contemporary facts as to how religious liberty fares in Christian countries, in the Communist world, and in non-Christian lands. The first deals with the history and nature of religious liberty, and reaches the conclusion that religious liberty is 'one aspect of the liberty of a conscience directly and personally related to God, and pledged to respect in all other men all those conditions which make such a relationship possible.'

It was a happy thought to ask a Waldensian to write this book. No one could have done it better. We wish it a world-wide circulation. The date at the bottom of p. 15 should be 392.

For his Inaugural Lecture as Principal of New College, Edinburgh, Professor J. H. S. Burleigh, D.D., B.Litt., took as title Tertullian's scornful question, *What Has Athens to do with Jerusalem?* and proceeded to discuss the perennial question of the relation of the Church to secular learning and contemporary culture. The lecture, now published by the Saint Andrew Press at 1s. 6d. net, is both an able and a useful piece of work with more than an historical interest.

The Status of Animals in the Christian Religion, by Major C. W. Hume, M.C., B.Sc. (Universities Federation for Animal Welfare; 8s. 6d. net), is a book which is quite out of the ordinary. Major Hume points out that the Prayer Book 'does not contain any prayer about animals or indicate whether consideration for them is a Christian virtue and cruelty a sin. The catechism does not refer to the subject.' He points out that, when questions regarding the suffering of animals arise in the House of Lords, the dignitaries of the Church of England make no contribution to the subject, however vocal they may be in regard to 'divorce, premium bonds, and commercial television.'

This is a book written in the crusading spirit, and it is written out of a wide scholarship which ranges over many fields, and which is always carefully and meticulously documented. It will certainly prove fascinating to the general reader. We have no doubt whatever that it will awaken sympathy for a cause which must lie near to the heart of any Christian man. The charming marginal drawings of Fougasse, depicting thumbnail sketches of animals in Biblical scenes, add greatly to the attractiveness of the volume.

Changing Attitudes to Religion in Contemporary English Philosophy

By the Reverend John Macquarrie, B.D., Ph.D., The University of Glasgow

It is well-known that the philosophical climate has undergone an almost complete change in England during the first half of the present century. Indeed, it has become customary to speak of the 'revolution' in philosophy. At the beginning of the century, the idealist school, associated with such great names as those of F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet and Edward Caird, dominated the scene and spoke with something of an air of finality. To-day, in England at least, that school has almost vanished away. A new kind of philosophy has taken its place. Of course, this new philosophy has been very influential elsewhere than in England, but whereas in Scotland and the United States, for instance, alternative points of view are still well to the fore, in England the new philosophy has assumed quite a commanding position in the universities. It has progressed from being the protest of a minority to becoming the established outlook of the majority, from being a heterodoxy to becoming a new orthodoxy. It was with some justification that Professor George Hughes declared that the disciples of the new philosophy seem to suppose that 'it is the only one which any sensible man can now hold.' [1]

When a political party ceases to be in opposition and is called to assume the reins of government, it almost invariably curbs some of its former excesses and assumes a more constructive—even more conservative—attitude to the problems of the day, for which it now has a new responsibility. A similar change of attitude has come over the philosophical movement of which we are speaking. In its beginnings, it assailed many traditional beliefs with an almost iconoclastic fervour. As it has become more and more established, its attitude has become increasingly constructive, and ways are being sought to rehabilitate some of the beliefs which at an earlier stage were being swept away. The changed attitude is to be seen even in the designation of the movement itself. It used to be known as 'logical positivism,' but most of its adherents now prefer such non-committal appellations as 'linguistic analysis' and 'logical analysis.' It will be our purpose in this article to consider some of the changes that have taken place or are taking place in the attitude to religion and theology.

What is this new philosophy which has come to occupy so dominant a place in contemporary thought? We may distinguish three strands which are interwoven into it. The first strand is a radical empiricism. In this respect, the new philosophy is really a reversion to the British empirical tradition which was interrupted for a time during the ascendancy of idealism. A second strand derives from modern developments in logic, which have led to a much wider understanding of the subject than was possible while it was still dominated by the traditional Aristotelian conceptions. A third strand, which is possibly the most typical of the movement, is to be found in the interest in language and the attempt to show that many of our philosophical problems arise from confusions of language.

Like every other philosophical movement, this one has its precursors in the past. The contemporary development, however, may be said to have opened with the appearance in 1922 of Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. This is a difficult book, intended for professional philosophers, but its somewhat cryptic concluding proposition is fraught with meaning for a much wider circle: 'Whereof one cannot speak, thereon one must be silent.' [2] In other words, there are some topics on which nothing meaningful can be said. What are these topics?

The answer to the question is given in a more popular form in Professor A. J. Ayer's brilliantly provocative book, *Language, Truth and Logic*, which in 1935 really put the new philosophy on the map, so to speak. Ayer recognized two kinds of propositions which can be meaningfully asserted. There are the analytic propositions of logic and mathematics. These are tautologies and assert nothing about reality. They get their meaning from our agreement to use certain symbols in certain ways and simply draw out the implications of our definitions. Then there are synthetic propositions, which do make assertions about the real world. They get their meaning from the fact that they can be verified with reference to some sense-experience. Thus if I say that 'Twice two are four,' or, 'There is a cat on the doorstep,' I am making meaningful assertions, the truth or falsity of which can be determined, in the first case with regard to the definitions of the terms used, in the second case by going and looking. But suppose I say with Browning, 'God's in his heaven.' This is not obviously a tautology, but neither can I verify

[1] *Mind* [January, 1949].

[2] *Op. cit.*, 189.

by any relevant sense-experience. It is, therefore, according to Ayer, meaningless, neither true nor false. Such, on this view, are all the statements of metaphysics, ethics, and theology. Since they fall to neither of the two meaningful categories, they are, strictly speaking, nonsense. At the most, they may be reckoned emotive utterances. Thus a man says 'God's in his heaven,' he asserts nothing meaningful, though the words may evince a feeling of optimism or well-being on his part.

An emotive theory, whether of ethics or theology, has, of course, its own difficulties. It could be argued that to have a feeling about something is also to have some understanding of it. Feeling, which undoubtedly enters into both morals and religion, is not mere emotion, but the understanding which belongs to it is not the objective understanding which we obtain on perceiving something with the senses, but rather the recognition of a situation in which we ourselves participate. Thus an emotive theory does not show that moral judgments or religious statements are meaningless, but raises the question of their meaning in a new form.[1] The value of Ayer's criticism lies principally in the fact that it shows the statements of ethics and theology to be of a different kind from the empirical propositions of science and of everyday experience.

The new philosophy, therefore, soon came to realize that it is unsatisfactory just to say that some propositions are meaningful, and the rest nonsense. Instead of laying down in advance what kinds of statements are to be regarded as meaningful, it took as its task the investigation of particular kinds of statements, seeing how they are used and what meaning can be assigned to them. This presumably marks the transition from logical positivism to linguistic analysis. Notable work of this kind has been done, for instance, in the field of ethics, in such books as Stephen Toulmin's *Reason in Ethics* [1949] and R. M. Hare's *The Language of Morals* [1952]. The cruder emotive theories of ethics have been for the most part abandoned, and their place taken by a careful study of ethical language.

What of religious and theological statements? The question might be raised whether they are open to some kind of verification. For instance, it seems to have been the consideration of his past experiences that led Joseph to assert his belief in divine providence.[2] But then the difficulty arises of finding a standard method of verification. K. R. Popper argues that to be meaningful, a statement must be falsifiable as well as verifiable, but in the case of religious statements, it seems that no experience is accepted as falsifying the statement. He gives the example of a man crossing the street and being narrowly missed by a bus. The man says, 'God loves me, for the bus did not hit me.' On another occasion he is struck by a bus and injured. This time he says, 'God loves me, for the bus did not kill me.' On a third occasion he is actually killed by the bus. But now his friends say, 'God loves him, for He has called him out of this sinful and unhappy world.' The ground of verification shifts each time, and nothing that happens would be taken as disproving the religious assertion. But in other cases, religious statements may not be amenable to any obvious kind of verification at all. They look like metaphysical statements, concerned with supersensible entities, and even if the linguistic philosopher is prepared to consider the rehabilitation of religion along with ethics, he is still quite definitely against the reinstatement of metaphysics.

This last point may be illustrated from a curious article by Professor J. N. Findlay.[3] He sets out to show that the modern denial that there can be rational evidence for a necessary existence is fatal to belief in the existence of God. His argument has been adequately criticized elsewhere, and we need not go into it here. What interests us is the conclusion. After having satisfied himself that his argument disposes of theism, Findlay proceeds to point out that it is not therefore fatal to religion. 'Non-existence,' he says, 'might be taken to be the "real meaning" of saying that religious objects and realities are not "of this world."' And he goes on: 'There is, then, a religious atheism . . . and we may be glad that this is so. For since the religious spirit is one of reverence before things greater than ourselves, we should be gravely impoverished and arrested if this spirit ceased to be operative in our personal and social life.' A distinction is made here between theism as a world-view and religion as an attitude of mind. And although many linguistic philosophers would reject Findlay's argument concerning the non-existence of God, they would accept the view that religion, if it can be justified at all, must be able to stand independently of any metaphysical view of the world.

Ronald Hepburn puts the point with great clarity: 'If we are convinced that Hume and Kant and their successors have once and for all refuted the arguments of rational apologetics, we are faced with a choice between agnosticism (or atheism) and the discovery of an alternative method of justifying belief.'[4] Just how seriously some of our philosophers—especially the younger ones—are taking

[1] See my article, 'Feeling and Understanding,' in *Theology*, lviii. [May, 1955], 179.

[2] Gn 45^{4-8}

[3] 'Can God's Existence be Disproved?' in *Mind* [April, 1948], reprinted in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*.

[4] *Metaphysical Beliefs*, 89.

this task of justifying belief may be seen from the large number of writings which have recently appeared on the subject. Within the past two years there have appeared the collection of papers entitled *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, including contributions by both Christians and non-Christians; Professor R. B. Braithwaite's Eddington Memorial Lecture, entitled *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief*; and a symposium by Stephen Toulmin, Ronald Hepburn, and Alasdair MacIntyre, entitled *Metaphysical Beliefs*. It would not be unfair to extend to most of the contributors to these volumes the description which Alasdair MacIntyre gives to the writers of the third: 'The writers of these essays,' he says, 'have in common two things: a belief that traditional metaphysics is dead, but that buried with it may lie important issues which might well be resuscitated; and an indebtedness to the revolution in contemporary philosophy which is associated with the name of Wittgenstein.'[1] But a study of the thoughtful and constructive tone of many of the writings which have been mentioned shows that we have gone far beyond the iconoclastic stage of the revolution.

Needless to say, no common doctrine has so far emerged from the enterprise. Each man interprets as he is able. The nearest approach to the traditional metaphysical world-view is probably to be found in R. M. Hare.[2] For him, religious belief is fundamentally a kind of slant upon the world, for which the ugly term 'blik' has been coined. Such a 'blik' is not something which we learn outside our ordinary sense-experience, but rather arises from the organizing and patterning of experience itself. The idea is an ingenious one, but is open to several objections. Hepburn, for instance, points out that it would hardly do for the Christian idea of God as transcendent. A slant upon our experience could hardly lead to anything beyond a pantheism. And the same writer also indicates that we seem to have something akin to the traditional argument from design, with all its difficulties.[3]

Hepburn himself offers a most interesting study of the affinities between the language of religion and that of poetry. He suggests that revelation works through 'the fabrication and development of symbols by which to interpret the nature of God and the life of man' and that 'Biblical images are the real *locus* of revelation.' Thus there is the possibility that 'we may develop a theology which gives supreme place not to reason but to revelation, making the Bible our almost exclusive source-book instead of the cosmos at large with its "design" or lack of design, its problems of origin and its "contingency."' Such a theology of images would explore the development of the great symbol-patterns of the Bible. Hepburn goes on to compare the Biblical images with the archetypes of Jung's psychology, and to describe how poetry and religion have a common aim in making men whole by bringing meaning and pattern into their lives. But it is another question when we ask whether the images apply to the world as it actually is. They can be shown to be meaningful, but what about their reference? We can understand the semantics of religion and poetry in which 'words are leaning far out from their normal orbits' but Hepburn cannot tell us whether in the end it may not be illusion.[4]

Some people, however, might think that the question of reference comes very awkwardly after the explication of symbolism which Hepburn has in mind. Must not the consideration of such reference drive us back into the 'rational apologetics' which Hepburn rejects? Has not enough been said when the symbols are explored and their integrating influence for human life has been shown? John McLeod Campbell once wrote: 'I believe that Christianity has its highest and ultimate evidence in what it is; that therefore to illustrate any element of Christianity successfully is to establish its claim on faith.'[5]

This brings us to look at Braithwaite's view of religious belief, which is undoubtedly the clearest that has so far been offered by the linguistic school. Unlike Hare, Braithwaite lays no claim to any 'blik' upon the world, and unlike Hepburn, he is concerned with rational argument rather than poetic imagery. In place of the narrower verification principle, Braithwaite suggests that we must find the meaning of a statement in the way in which it is used. A religious statement, he maintains, is used to announce allegiance to a policy of moral action. Thus if I say 'God is love,' that is equivalent to showing forth my intention of following an agapeistic way of life. But religion differs from simple morality because the religious man entertains in his mind the set of stories belonging to his religion. He may not believe some of these stories, but just to entertain them provides a powerful psychological aid towards carrying out his moral policy. On this view, the essence of religion lies in willing, and neither in emotion nor in holding a particular world-view.[6]

These three samples illustrate the diversity of the approach to religion among linguistic analysts. Yet they have several things in common. They all

[1] *Op. cit.*, 9.

[2] In *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*.

[3] *Metaphysical Beliefs*, 128–129.

[4] 'Poetry and Religious Belief,' in *Metaphysical Beliefs*.

[5] Preface to *The Nature of the Atonement*[2].

[6] *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Belief*.

distrust traditional metaphysics. They are all concerned to find and clarify the meaning of religious statements as the first step in any justifying of belief. And—which is probably most important—they understand that religion is primarily a way of life, rather than holding an opinion about the ultimate nature of the universe.

What response has there been from the side of theology? Theologians also have been turning their attention to questions of religious language. For instance, Austin Farrer has devoted himself to the study of the imagery and symbolism of the Bible. His work has much in common with Hepburn's approach. Again, the theology of demythologizing, though moving in a different context of ideas, is concerned to translate mythical language into statements the significance of which lies in what they say to human existence. One might also mention the far-reaching research which has been carried out into the meanings of Biblical terms, as in Kittel's great *Wörterbuch*. Finally, reference must also be made to Professor I. T. Ramsey as another scholar who is alive to the question of the meaning of religious statements. The publication of his book, *Religious Language*, in the autumn of 1957, will be an important contribution to the current discussion.

It is impossible to pass any kind of judgment on an enterprise which is still going on, and is, indeed, still in its early stages. It is safe to say, however, that few people in 1935 could have foreseen that twenty years later linguistic philosophy would be making such interesting and constructive contributions to the philosophy of religion. One definite gain may be already recorded. It is the insistence on clarity, and on getting our meanings straight before we try to discuss them. There certainly have been changes, and changes are still going on, in the attitudes of linguistic philosophers to religion and theology. We may confidently expect that the present and future discussions will bring useful results for philosophy and theology alike.

Contributions and Comments

Waw explicative in Amos vii. 14

In the recent discussion on Am 7^{14} (The Expository Times, lxvii. [December 1955] 91 f. [July 1956] 318; lxviii. [December 1956] 94) each of the contributors rightly emphasized that Amos' words 'I am no prophet' cannot deny his being a real prophet. The problem is a philological one: how must these and the following words be understood? Professor G. R. Driver proposed that *lō'* has here, as in other texts, interrogative, asseverative force. But there is another possible explanation which finds the problem not in *lō'*, but in *wĕ*. This conjunction seems to have here the explicative sense of 'that is, namely', for which Brown-Driver-Briggs quote many examples (*sub verbo*, 1 *b*), for example, Gn 4^{4}: 'Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, *that is*, from their fat portions'; 1 S 17^{40}: David 'chose five smooth stones from the brook, and put them in his shepherd's equipment (*kĕlî*), *that is*, in his wallet'; Zech 9^{9}: 'Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on an ass, *that is*, on a colt the foal of an ass.'

As for Am 7^{14} we must keep in mind that the word *nābî'* can have a double sense. Firstly it means a professional *nābî'*, one who by his own free choice joined one of the religious guilds of the *nĕbî'îm*. Secondly it has the more specific meaning of a prophet whom God has called to announce His words. This ambiguity was sometimes avoided by characterizing the professional *nĕbî'îm* as the 'sons of the prophets,' but this nomenclature did not last nor was it universal. *Nābî'* continued to be used in both meanings. Now, Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, supposing that Amos was a professional *nābî'*, tried to frighten him away from the sanctuary and told him to go and earn his living as a *nābî'* in Judah. Amos, though a prophet called by God, could very well have been, at the same time, a member of a prophetic guild, but he was not and therefore protested: 'I am no *nābî'*!' But scarcely had he uttered these words, when he remembered the ambiguity of the term. He is a *nābî'* in one sense, but not in the other. He added, therefore, an explanation by using a more precise term having but one meaning: 'I am no *nābî'*, *that is*, I am no *ben-nābî'*,' I am no professional, self-chosen *nābî'*, but a prophet whom God has called. Amaziah addressed him as a 'seer' (*ḥōzeh*), because Amos foretold future events. This does not conflict with the priest's supposition that Amos is one of the sons of the prophets, since there were 'seers' among them who prophesied by means of clairvoyance or dreams.

It might be added, though irrelevant for the above discussion, that *v.* 14b, as *v.* 14a, seems to demand the present sense: 'but I *am* a herdsman, and a dresser of sycomore trees.' For, while the sons of the prophets, when giving themselves to religious profession, gave up for ever their former occupation, it is by no means necessary to assume

that Amos did the same. He is still a herdsman and will go back to his flock as soon as the Lord will permit him to do so.

ERNEST VOGT

Rome

Father Vogt's explanation of Amos' exclamation is, of course, perfectly satisfactory from the grammatical point of view, but for that very reason unconvincing; for it does not ring true to the circumstances in which the prophet finds himself. He has been challenged and bidden to go away and not meddle where he has no business to be, obviously because he is not a 'court-prophet' ready always to prophesy 'good' and not 'evil' (cf. 1 K 22^{6-23}). On my view, he indignantly exclaims 'I not a prophet or the son of a prophet!', thereby implying that he is a prophet and entitled to be where he is and wherever he may be on the Lord's business, even though he is only a herdsman or the like by occupation. Is he likely to have said: 'I'm not a prophet—no, I mean, a son of a prophet,' *i.e.*, a professional prophet? Such a correction on a technicality and the invocation of an 'explicative *wāw*' weakens the form of the prophet's protest and savours not of the open air on the Judæan hills but of a scholar's lamp.

G. R. DRIVER

Oxford

The Judgment in 2 Peter iii.

ACCORDING to 2 P $3^{7, 10-12}$ the final judgment will take the form of a world conflagration by fire in which the elements will melt in the burning heat. This idea of the judgment in one of the latest documents of the New Testament also appears in the Qumran Thanksgiving Ps 3^{19-36}.

When the line fell on judgment,
and the lot of anger on those who were forsaken;
a molten mass of wrath on dissemblers,
and a period of wrath for all worthlessness.
The cords of death surrounded me inescapably;
the torrents of Belial flowed over all the high banks.
Like a fire eating into all their springs,
destroying every green or dry tree in their channels. . . .

The foundations of the mountains are given to the flames;
the roots of flint become torrents of pitch.
It devours to the great abyss; . . .

For God thunders with the noise of his might,
and his holy dwelling re-echoes with his glorious truth;
the host of heaven utter their voice;
the eternal foundations melt and shake;
(Burrows translation.)

The origin of this idea probably lies in Iranian thought; cf. the world judgment in Pahlavi *Bundahesh*, xxx. 19.20:

Then will the fire-god and the god Airyaman melt the metals that are in the mountains and hills, and they will flow over the earth like rivers. And they will make all men to pass through that molten metal and make them clean.

The doctrine of the Two Spirits in the Qumran *Manual of Discipline* is certainly Iranian and this Pahlavi text may now safely be given a pre-Christian date. It would seem that a stream of Iranian influence entered Judaism in the last centuries before the Christian era and formed part of the background of the New Testament writers.

L. W. BARNARD

Shaw, Wilts

Chiasmus in St. Matthew vii. 6

IT is sometimes said that in the saying concerning dogs and swine the fourth line is to be taken with the first, and the third with the second, an 'a-b-b-a' arrangement known of course as chiasmus:

Give not that which is holy unto the dogs,
neither cast your pearls before the swine,
lest haply they trample them under their feet,
and turn and rend you.

The suggestion is not a new one. Two hundred years ago John Wesley in his *Notes on the New Testament* wrote: 'Here is another instance of that transposition, where, of the two things proposed, the latter is first treated of. Give not—to dogs—lest turning they rend you: Cast not—to swine—lest they trample them under foot.'

Two hundred years earlier still, Tindale in his translation (1534) brought out the same meaning: 'Geve not that which is holy to dogges, nether cast ye youre pearles before swyne, lest they treade them under their fete, and the other tourne agayne and all to rent you.' The Great Bible of 1539 followed Tindale in inserting 'the other' which obviously points back to the 'dogges.'

Curiously enough if we go back from the sixteenth to the fourteenth century we find the matter put even more plainly in the Wyclif version of 1380, the word for dogs (houndis) being repeated: 'Nile ye yeue holi thing to houndis, nether cast ye youre margaritis bifor swyne; leest parauenture thei defoule hem with her feet, and the houndis be turned; and al to tere you.'

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

London

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

T.T.

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'And every man that striveth in the games is temperate in all things. Now they do it to receive a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible.'—1 Co 9[25] (R.V.).

To thousands of keen motor-cyclists these two letters spell thrills. For each summer in the tiny Isle of Man the most exciting races in all the world are held over thirty-seven and a half miles of mountain gradients, hairpin bends, narrow roads, and hump-backed bridges. Every machine which competes must be a standard production model. The winner in his class receives the coveted Tourist Trophy—and that name shows where the letters 'T.T.' come from, and also explains that the object is to test ordinary tourist machines.

This year the races were something special, for in June it was exactly fifty years since they were started. There must have been some strange-looking contraptions in the first races in 1907! The aim was to encourage makers to design new motor-cycles and to improve every part of them. And that aim has been fulfilled. The modern motor-cycle is a very wonderful machine, and every boy in his teens hopes that he will one day own one. The gruelling course in the Manx hills has produced marvels of engineering.

Yes, there are accidents. Every year some of the most daring riders finish up in Noble's Hospital at Douglas, and sometimes one is killed. That is rather terrible, but it leads to inventions for the greater safety of the ordinary rider. Ever since Jesus lived, some men have learned the joy of disciplined daring on behalf of others.

Ronald Ross was one man who learned it, and—since we are thinking of anniversaries—he was born exactly a hundred years ago. He became a doctor, and devoted his life to trying to find the cause of malaria. He found that it was spread by mosquitoes, and he conducted thousands of experiments on the tiny stomachs of those insects. Nobody believed Ross would succeed. So he worked alone in the dangerous hot swamps. He spent all his savings. He went without food. On the day when he made his final discovery he collapsed from starvation and fatigue beside the test-tubes he was studying. Now we all know him as *Sir* Ronald Ross, and millions of men and women live safely in hot climates because of the discipline to which he subjected himself.

When you read books by Robert Louis Stevenson—like *Treasure Island* and *Black Arrow*—you notice how wonderfully the language flows. R. L. S. struggled to use words properly. He would re-write a paragraph a dozen times until it was quite perfect. He disciplined himself to make words his perfect tools. That is how he won his crown—for many of us think of him as the greatest English stylist.

But St. Paul was the real master of self-discipline. Our text is part of a wonderful passage (1 Co 9[22-27]—you read it through) in which he says that he will never win the race unless he is fit: he will never beat his opponent in a boxing bout if he flays the air with his arms. The true athlete must train, bullying himself in limb and wind so that he may be fit. And the Christian athlete must be fit—for the service Christ demands of him.

By the way, T.T. doesn't always stand for Tourist Trophy. Sometimes it stands for 'teetotal.' Many of us believe that the Christian discipline includes keeping away from things like alcohol which can make us quite unfit for service. Paul wasn't thinking about that when he used the word 'temperate' in our text; but there is no prize in life for the man who lets himself become a slave of evil habit.

The Hidden God

By the Reverend John R. Gray, V.R.D., B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'Lo, he goeth by me, and I see him not.'—Job 9[11].

Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I wonder what you are
Up above the world so high
Like a diamond in the sky.

That's a poem we all learn, boys and girls, when we are little and it is a poem we never forget. Every time we go out after dark and look up and see the stars we are reminded of it. And we should often take time to look up into the night sky, for stars are lovely things.

One night when I was leaving a friend's house I looked up and somewhat sadly said, 'There are no stars to-night.' 'You're wrong,' said my friend, 'there are lots of them, just as many as ever, thousands upon thousands. It is just that we cannot see them.' He was right, of course. Often, in the city especially, smoke or fog or low clouds hide the stars from us completely, but they are there just the same.

It is good to know that that is so ; that always the stars are twinkling away up in the sky—even when we can see nothing but inky blackness. It is true equally of God. Sometimes clouds of pride or anger, the smoke of our battles, the fog of our silliness, hide God from us. But He is there just the same behind the clouds. He is there—always—even when you and I cannot see Him.

'Lo, he goeth by me,' said Job, 'and I see him not.'

Why They Pushed the Vestry Down [1]

They pushed the vestry down because they wanted to get inside. Probably that has never happened in your church, but then your church vestry is not likely to be used as a hospital. If it were, it would not be the only hospital for a hundred miles.

The vestry was in Africa. A long way up-country, in West Africa, there is a tribe of people called the Ogoni. The way to their villages was hard and difficult, through the thick bush. Very few white people ever visited them, but one of these few was a doctor. He was a missionary whose proper 'station' was at a hospital a hundred miles away, but twice every year, for a few days, he went off to see the Ogoni people and do what he could for them. On his tours he visited other tribes, just as remote, to spend a day or two giving them medicine, doing a few minor operations and, of course, speaking to them of Jesus.

Some of the Ogoni were Christians, and they had built a small church in their main 'town.' It was the vestry of this church that the doctor used for a clinic. As soon as they knew he had arrived, scores and scores of folk would begin to crowd round the church. The real pushers managed to get inside, the others waited outside or shoved at the door. There was no queueing, and none of the quietness of an out-patients' department at one of our hospitals. The doctor examined sores and wounds, gave pills, medicines and injections, pulled out teeth or cut away the bad flesh from nasty places on arms or legs and bandaged them up with clean white cloth—all in the midst of noisy, chattering, shouting crowds. Even he got a shock, however, when there was a crash like the bursting of a bomb. It was the wall of the vestry collapsing. The people outside, struggling to get in, had pushed it over.

After that, he had to work in the open air, until the nurse brought him word that the bandages had come to an end, there was no more medicine, and the pills were running short. He told the waiting crowds that he could do no more for them on that visit. Those who had not been able to get help would have to wait for another six months.

It was the next morning that some of the chiefs came to see him. 'We have been taxing our people for the last couple of years,' they told him, 'and they have given us their money very willingly. Now we have nearly two thousand pounds. We want you to build a clinic or a little hospital amongst our Ogoni people.'

The doctor looked far sadder than they had thought he would look. He should have been delighted. They went on again. 'We want you to send us a doctor of our own, who will live amongst us and run the hospital. Will you do that ? '

'No,' answered the doctor sadly. Then he went on to explain that there were not enough doctors working for the missionary society to fill the places where there were already hospitals. It was just not possible. They had collected their two thousand pounds for nothing.

The chiefs looked as if they could not believe what he said. They asked him if there were not a great many doctors in England. He agreed that there were. And had he not been telling them for a long time that God loved them as much as He loved the white people ?

'Why doesn't God speak to some of the doctors and tell them to come and help us ? ' they asked.

The missionary answered very quietly. 'I think He does. But they don't always listen ! '

[1] Cyril J. Davey, *The Golden Arrow*, 53 f. A review of this new book is given in 'Literature.'

The Christian Year

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Doubt, and the Way to Faith

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, D.D., GLASGOW

'Who through him are believers in God.'—1 P 1[21] (R.V.).

This is meant to be a sermon for any who find it difficult to be sure of their religious faith.

Some points that used to worry thoughtful people are not regarded to-day with the same anxiety. How is it that the Bible sometimes gives slightly different accounts of the same events ? Can one claim to believe in Christ without quite understanding, or agreeing with, all that Paul says about the Cross ? Should we be perplexed because the story of the Creation in Genesis does not put events in the right scientific order, or allow for the slow process of evolution ?

It is not such points that now cause worry.

What troubles people to-day, if they are troubled, is rather a total doubt. Is there any meaning in the Universe? Is it not all chaos and absurdity? Or, at least, is it not an entire mystery about which it is foolish, with our little capacity for understanding, to try to reach any conclusion?

Now here we are touching on questions that have occupied learned men and philosophers. But it is possible to say some simple things that can be of help to every man.

That distinguished writer of the Victorian age, George Gissing, whose literary career was a long struggle against poverty and neglect, has left in one of his letters a singularly beautiful statement of his ideas about religion. He was an agnostic—he just could not reach any certainty of conviction. Here is what he says. 'It is very good to acknowledge a grand mystery. . . . How to go further I know not. That there is some order, some purpose, seems a certainty. My mind at all events refuses to grasp the idea of a Universe which means nothing at all. But just as unable I am to accept any of the solutions ever proposed. Above all, it is the existence of natural beauty which haunts my thought. I can, for a time, forget the world's horrors. I can never forget the flower by the wayside and the sun falling in the west. Those things have a meaning, but I doubt—I doubt—whether the mind of man will ever be permitted to know it.' Notice how the sense of beauty forced him, or almost forced him, to some sort of faith.

There are those who, like Gissing, are constantly aware of, and impressed by, the beauty of the world. We cannot understand how and why we are able to see and feel it. But it is undoubtedly there—a fact to be taken into account. 'Consider the lilies,' said Jesus, and He drew from the wonder of their beauty a lesson about the power and love of God.

It may well be said, however, that a still more impressive and profound fact than beauty is the presence of virtue in mankind. Wherever we look, besides what is horrible and squalid in the lives of men, there are to be seen amazing, shining examples of honour, goodness of heart, self-sacrifice, loyalty. The too little known poet Ralph Hodgson calls one of his poems the *Song of Honour*.

> The song of all both high and low
> To some blest vision true,
> . . . . . .
> The song of pretty fighters all
> And high heroic things—
> . . . . . .
> Dog-loyalties to faith and friend,
> And loves like Ruth's of old no end,
> And intermission none—

He says that as we see such things in the world our hearts must be touched with pity and pride and 'warm to all mankind.'

The world shows countless instances of love for the unlovely, of noble martyrdoms for the cause of freedom, of people preferring honour and virtue to ease or pleasure. There is no explanation of these facts by science or in Nature. How do they get into human nature, unless from some higher source and inspiration, unless from the spirit of God at work in human hearts.

Great support for faith may thus be found in the existence of beauty in the world, and in the existence of noble elements of goodness in human lives. A Christian, however, would say that, without disregarding all that, what counts for him is the fact that Jesus Christ is there. And, when we look at Him, we do not see Him standing alone, we see Him continually along with God the Father, revealing God's power, speaking God's words, so that, in Peter's words, 'We believe in God, through Him.' The Christian position is that there is nothing of which we are so sure as this. The Christian holds that while there have been great events in history on a vast scale, convulsions of Nature, battles, plagues, new discoveries, triumphs and tragedies, nothing has ever happened in history to compare with the revelation Jesus made in His life and above all in His death upon the Cross, a revelation of God's love and mercy. Here is the supreme event of all the ages, the unique and enduring landmark in the course of time.

It seems a tremendous thing to say of one short life and of the mortal suffering of one long afternoon; but this and nothing less, is the testimony of Christians to their Lord.

> In the Cross of Christ I glory,
> Towering o'er the wrecks of time.
> . . . . .
> Rock of Ages cleft for me,
> Let me hide myself in Thee.

The world is a different place because Jesus lived and died in it and rose again.

In one place in the Epistle to the Hebrews the author admits how unsatisfying are the conditions of this struggling human life when we take a view of it; and then he goes over to the great comforting fact 'But we see Jesus'—and this assures us that the end will be salvation.

You may have doubts. But there is beauty in the world and there is honour and virtue, and above all we see Jesus Christ. Therefore, stand by your faith or be led to faith in God.

There is, however, one more thing to say. You may have been looking at the Universe as it were from the point of view of a spectator or critic.

But is man qualified to look at the universe from outside? You are yourself part of the world. You are inside the situation you are examining. The only way you can know the world is by living in it, by feeling and acting in it as well as by thinking about it, just as you can only know what a game really is by playing in it.

The fact of beauty does not count anything for one who is not thrilled by loveliness. The value, the preciousness of honour and virtue is not appreciated by those who have not known themselves what it is to cherish a dear friend, or stand by a comrade in danger or temptation. The only way really to know a person is through fellowship. Indeed knowledge of every kind involves living active experience. And so it is with knowledge of Jesus Christ.

To know Him is not to read about Him or discuss the truth of His words or speculate, as theology does, about the mystery of His personality and the meaning of His Cross. By all these ways we may indeed be helped, but to know Him is to encounter Him as One who draws us with the cords of love, who commands us as Lord and Master, who demands our loyalty and giving us all, even life itself, puts us infinitely in His debt.

The Christian end is to have all doubts swept away in the actual experience of what it is to live, to feel and will and do in fellowship with Jesus Christ. Then we will be brought to say with Peter that 'through Him we are believers in God.'

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Involvement of God

BY THE REVEREND R. WATSON MATHEWSON, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'Such knowledge is too wonderful for me.'—Ps 139[6].

If you live in London and possess a Very High Frequency radio receiver it is almost inevitable that in tuning-in to the Home or Light or Third, you will occasionally stumble on one of the wave-bands used by Scotland Yard to communicate with the squad cars of the Metropolitan Police.

It is fascinating and disturbing to listen to these messages as I did recently.

Here was a London quite different from the London of the green parks, the opulent hotels, the cosmopolitan crowds, the well-groomed business men and fashionable women, the cockney wit, the courteous bus conductors. Here was the tragic, the anxious, the frightened London, London with the lid off.

Without pause the messages went out to this car and that directing each to the scene of the incidents reported by the incoming 999 calls. Without pause from every quarter of the great city one urgent human need after another arose, one cry for help after another. From my chair I heard the news being made.

At that very moment intruders were inside the house in Ealing while the anxious neighbour stood in the shadow of the hedge outside, awaiting the help he had summoned. At that very moment an ambulance was speeding to the aid of the road casualties lying on the pavement of an Islington avenue, and a woman was dying of an overdose of sleeping tablets in a Bayswater Hotel, and somewhere through the streets of the city a black Standard Vanguard was speeding, registration number given, containing two children, aged nine and eleven, and their father, aged thirty-nine, of suicidal tendencies at the wheel.

Listen to these Police messages and the great anonymous city breaks down into separate streets and houses and families and individuals. The vast crime problem is given reality in the break-in at 31 Acacia Grove. The problem of juvenile delinquency becomes concrete in the Teddy Boys committing assault at Lancaster Gate Tube Station. The statistics of the toll of the roads narrow down to the one or two persons involved in the accident at the intersection of Brighton Road and Croydon Boulevard.

Listen to the Police messages and you realize how impersonal as a rule is our knowledge of the whole human situation. Except where they touch us directly what do we know of the world's continuous heart-break and loss and madness and evil? Our knowledge is largely statistical and obsolete. Last year so many thousand Indians died from starvation, so many refugees awaited resettlement. We are not tuned into the contemporaneous personal wave-length. And could we stand it if we were? Could we bear the burden of a complete knowledge of every pang that rends the human heart? Listen to the Police messages and you come, if only by a fraction, a little nearer to understanding the perfect knowledge that God has of all life—God, from whom nothing is hid, to whom there are no anonymous multitudes, but only men and women, boys and girls, families with their own particular reasons for joy or sorrow, for obedience or rebellion.

It is of this knowledge that the psalmist says, it 'is too wonderful for me.' He, too, has his peep-hole, into the secret places of his own heart rather than into the tragedies of others; but he finds there equally, the depth of God's involvement in his life.

He discovers there for one thing, he tells us, the

omniscience of God. 'O Lord, thou hast searched me, and known me.' If we look under the surface of our own lives we find the same thing. We have never truly imagined that our most secret thoughts are entirely concealed. However tightly we may have closed our minds against the scrutiny of even our nearest and dearest we have never hoped to close them altogether against the observation of God.

That is particularly the case when we meet God in Christ. There is no evading Christ with the excuse, 'You don't understand me. You don't know my type of person.' The trouble is He knows us too well, this Saviour of whom it was written that He knew what was in man. The thought may be comforting or upsetting, but this is truth—that there is no detail of our lives, no plan, no pain of which God does not know.

Further, the psalmist found, when he looked under the surface of life, the omnipresence of God. 'Whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

In the most real moments of our lives we have discovered the same thing. Not all our prayers have seemed to be directed to the empty air. We have felt the Divine approach in the wonders of Nature, in the warnings of conscience.

But again, supremely we have known God near us in Jesus Christ, as we have listened to His comfortable words, or have set out on life again in faith, relying on His promised presence. And there are those who have told me they have found a Companion in the valley of the shadow of death itself, and I believe them. All our deepest convictions affirm the psalmist's assertion, 'Wherever I am, Thou art there.'

Once again the psalmist looks into his life and finds another aspect of God's involvement in it, the Divine omnipotence. 'Thou didst create me. Thou hast laid Thine hand upon me.'

A moment's honest thought and we also realize our utter dependence upon the continued activity of the creative power of God. He chose the time of our arrival here. Without the arrangements of His providence our lives could not be sustained. Without the exercise of His mercy and grace our lives would not be worth sustaining. We sense an active Will alongside our wills, a creative mind surely setting the things that happen to us into some eternal pattern.

So the psalmist finds, as we can, within his own experience the signs of God's perfect knowledge of all human life, the extent of His involvement.

But is there not something missing? Is it really enough to assure the woman whose husband drives suicidally through the streets of London that God is all-knowing, ever-present, all-powerful? Will that be sufficient to wipe away the tears that must follow the accident at the intersection? Will it stay the hand reaching for the overdose of sleeping tablets? All-knowing, ever-present, all-powerful. Yes, but does He care? The answer is there in the Gospels. He does care.

The whole story has not been told until we see a Figure looking down on all the cities of the world as once He looked down on Jerusalem, weeping because He was, so to speak, tuned in to the sin and suffering and sorrow, present and future, in every street and home and heart below Him.

The whole story has not been told till we see that same Saviour on His cross, not only outside the city wall but within, where the youths are brawling in the Camden Town cinema, and in the Hotel room where the desperate soul plans to end everything, and at the corner of Brighton Road and Croydon Boulevard—or for that matter in your home or my heart wherever one of the Father's children cries out in need. For the wounds of the world are the wounds of God, the wounds that save.

Such knowledge is too wonderful for us. We cannot understand it. But we can trust it.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Christus Victor

BY THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A., B.D., MANCHESTER

'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive.'—Eph 4^8.

The day of a victorious general's 'triumph' was always a red-letter day in ancient Rome. The whole population of the city would line the streets, cheering the triumphant procession on its way—the idolized general, the soldiers bearing aloft the spoils of battles won on the far-flung borders of the Empire, and, finally, dragging themselves along in chains, a sorry sight, the prisoners-of-war captured from the enemies. The day on which the victor is welcomed home! It was (and indeed still is—as every one knows who has witnessed the scenes of enthusiasm that greet a football team bringing the Cup home from Wembley!) a red-letter day in the fullest sense.

Perhaps it is not too fanciful to suggest that heaven too had its red-letter day. For she, too, had sent One forth to do battle in a far country. He had fought His battle—the bitterest and most momentous battle ever engaged in—and, though He had been wounded sore, He had emerged gloriously victorious. And so the day had come for Him to return to His proper home: 'When he had by himself purged our sins' (for that was

the issue that had hung on the encounter), He 'sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high' (He 1^3). It is not difficult to imagine the royal welcome that greeted Him in heaven :

Hark ! the choirs of angel voices
Joyful hallelujahs sing,
And the portals high are lifted
To receive their heavenly King.

And when this triumphant home-coming took place, says Paul in our text, 'he led captivity captive.' This expression represents a Hebrew idiom meaning to lead into captivity a host of captives. Like the Roman general returning to Rome, the Ascended Christ is pictured as bringing with Him His vanquished enemies—bound in chains. The language is, of course, figurative ; it is Paul's vivid, dramatic way of presenting the all-important truth that Christ is Victor, and Absolute Victor.

1. This theme of Christ's triumph over all the powers of evil sounds forth in every part of the New Testament. We hear it in Jesus' own comment upon the success which attended the mission of His disciples : 'I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven' (Lk 10^{18}). We hear it again in the Fourth Gospel in such words as 'Now is the judgment of this world : now shall the prince of this world be cast out' (Jn 12^{31}). Again, Paul speaks of Christ spoiling the 'principalities and powers' and making 'a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in' the Cross (Col 2^{15}). The unanimous testimony of the New Testament writers is that, by His life, death and resurrection, Christ has gained an absolute, complete and permanent ascendancy over all His enemies. And in the bold metaphor of our text, Paul goes so far as to claim that He has bound all those enemies in chains as captives.

2. Over against this unanimous testimony of the New Testament, however, there stands—or so it would seem—the no less unanimous testimony of history and experience. The history of the world, and the experience of men, during the nineteen centuries that have elapsed since the New Testament was written, would hardly seem to confirm the view that the powers of evil have been decisively overthrown. Sinners are no less sinful to-day than they were in Old Testament times. Temptation is just as real an experience to men to-day as ever it was. In the light of the facts of history, and in the light of our own personal experience of the moral struggle and the power and subtlety of temptation, it is certainly not easy to believe that Satan and all his hosts have been utterly vanquished and bound in chains.

3. We are thus seemingly confronted with two conflicting testimonies—that of the New Testament on the one hand, and that of history and experience on the other. What then is to be done ? Must we admit that, on this theme, the testimony of Scripture is misleading ? By no means ! There is a sense—and a real sense—in which it can be claimed that Satan and all his hosts have been overthrown and bound as captives.

In seeking to discover the sense in which this is true, we must first admit, quite frankly, that it certainly is *not* true in the sense that the forces of evil have ceased entirely to operate in this world. Satan still retains a real measure of freedom to conduct his infernal traffic amongst men. Whilst admitting this, however, let us remember for our comfort that even this measure of freedom is his only for a season. Satan himself is aware of this, and that fact makes him all the fiercer in employing to the utmost that measure of freedom, which is still his, before the end comes : 'the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time' (Rev 12^{12}). Nevertheless, there is a sense in which, *even now*, the devil and his hosts are in captivity to Christ.

A familiar Old Testament story may help us to understand what that sense is. I am thinking of the story of Daniel in the lions' den. No doubt many transgressors had, from time to time, been thrown to those lions ; and no doubt they had all suffered the same fate as befell those who were cast in after Daniel had come out alive : 'the lions had the mastery of them, and brake all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den' (Dn 6^{24}). But as for Daniel, 'no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he believed in his God.' God sent His angel, and 'shut the lions' mouths.'

The world in which the Christian lives is not unlike a lion's den ; at least St. Peter thought so, for he warned his fellow-Christians that 'your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour' (1 P 5^8). As we have seen, the devil and his hosts are still at large in the world, wreaking untold havoc. But the Christian may take comfort in the assurance that if he cleaves to Christ by faith, and walks through the world in His company, then Satan and all the hosts of hell will be unable to harm him. For the glorious truth is that they dare not come near Him. Charles Wesley tells us what happens to the devils in the presence of Christ :

Jesus ! the name high over all,
In hell, or earth, or sky ;
Angels and men before it fall,
And *devils fear and fly*.

In the presence of Christ, the devils and all the forces of wickedness—like the lions in the presence

of the angel who stood guard over Daniel—are in utter captivity; they are as it were bound in chains. In that Divine Presence, therefore, the Christian is safe. '*In* all these things'—in the midst of the temptations and tribulations of this world in which the forces of Satan still, for a season, walk about like roaring lions, seeking whom they may devour—'we are more than conquerors through him that loved us' (Ro 8^{37})—through Him who, 'when he ascended up on high . . led captivity captive' and became the Absolute and Eternal Victor, to whom belongs the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Man's Deepest Need

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW

'Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.'—Ac 3^{6}.

'Silver and gold have I none,' said Peter, but even if he had been a millionaire it would have made no difference. Still the crippled beggar would have looked into Peter's face in vain. For silver and gold were not his deepest need.

How often he had watched the worshippers passing by and had longed to be like them. Oh, to be done with this abject dependence on man's pity! Every time he had grasped at the coin carelessly tossed at him he had felt the more depraved. Oh, that I could walk! 'Merciful God, give me the strength of other men that with self-reliance I may win my daily bread.' In view of what happened to him this must have been the impotent man's passionate prayer. Yet, important as that dominant desire was, the mere fulfilling of it did not answer his deepest need.

What he required most was a new relationship with God. No money! Then what had Peter to give? He waited. He listened. 'In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.' He obeyed—and walked.

The full significance of Peter's words for this man we do not know. May be he knew Jesus, had seen Him a few months ago going into the Temple, had seen, or at least had heard, the uproar when Jesus had cleansed the House of God. In his own dim way he had made up his mind about who Jesus was. At any rate, when he heard His name, it was as if God had spoken to him, and, when in response to his obedience, he was made a new man, he knew it was God who had entered his life. To God he gave the praise.

A new experience of God! It was this man's deepest need; and every man's. This surely is where we so often fail. We offer men silver and gold when we should offer them God revealed in Jesus Christ.

We see man caught in the snare of evil, see how the gospel alone can set him free and offer him the Lord Jesus Christ to extricate him from his desperate predicament. Thus the gospel becomes a means of serving limited and temporal ends.

Is it war? We see the hand of each nation gripping the hilt of the sword. 'Receive the Lord Jesus Christ,' we cry. 'Let Him reign in your hearts and affairs and your swords will be beaten into ploughshares.' It is so true and yet it was not just to usher men into a warless world that the Lord Jesus came.

Is it our industrial strife? The tension between management and men can so easily snap and we discover ourselves bitterly estranged from one another. 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ,' we say. 'He will show you how to solve your problems with justice.' Again it is so true but not merely for this purpose did the Lord Jesus endure the Cross. He came that man might have a new experience of God and thus satisfy his direst need.

Man wants a new experience of God. This is the paradox of his nature. At one and the same time, he does and he does not want this experience of God. Lord Alanbrooke laments, at one stage in the last War, 'It is not sufficient to see something clearly. You have got to convince countless people as to where the truth lies when they do not want to be convinced.' So man sees clearly where his need lies and yet does not want to be convinced. He is like the doctor in *The Tale of Two Cities*, who, although he had been confined to the Bastille for twenty years and was now free, preferred to live in a dark garret under lock and key, a prisoner still.

Strange it is when man's life is so uncertain, so liable to mischance and disease and when he knows that finally the sentence of death has been pronounced over his head that he is not acutely aware of his need of God. He is destined for the eternal world. There he belongs. And it is this life that is offered him in the gospel.

In our experience two sets of circumstances awaken and make active this sense of man's desperate need for God. One of them consists of the adversities which overtake man. Sometimes we are so overwhelmed that we have no hope in ourselves or in our fellow-men; then, in the dust, life's glory dead, we realize that our need can only be met in God. The other circumstance that kindles in us sincere desire for God is when we are

confronted by the Lord Jesus Christ, like this man in the story. He lets us see our real plight and, opening our eyes to the rich mercy and eternal love of God, He receives us into the everlasting Kingdom.

Man is remade by a new experience of God. When, like this helpless cripple, we have received God, not for what He gives but for what He is, things begin to happen. We are taken up into the Divine Nature and our natures are changed. Because our spiritual desires have been quickened, our natural desires are given a new direction and power.

We become different people in our own eyes, no longer caught in the mesh of circumstance but men and women set free by the power of the eternal life within us. Long years ago, Arthur Rowlatt played a vital part in the British connexion with Egypt and, when he died, an intimate observer said of him, 'He gave me the impression of a mind thoroughly stayed on a Higher Power and so ready to meet life's changes calmly.' It makes us potent factors in the life of society. The range and depth of our social responsibilities are so altered that we become concerned for men and women and their conditions with something like the love of God in our hearts. 'You cannot make a permanent society by tying a bundle of selfish people together,' someone has said, 'with some rotten string of class or self-interest.' That is no longer to us the trite remark of a superficial critic but the conviction of people, the spring of whose action in society has been tempered by the sacrificial love of God in Christ. New principles and policies of social action wait upon this new experience of God. The remaking of man and of his world finds its secret in this acceptance of the gospel, not because these are the ends it is meant to serve but because men are God's children and this is God's world and because His everlasting love, received into our hearts, encompasses them all.

Man communicates a new experience of God. This is one of the salutary demonstrations of this story. Suppose this cripple laid daily at the gate of the Temple had known Jesus before, suppose he had concluded that God in some unique way was associated with Jesus, how did he realize that Jesus had now come to him and offered him this new life? Was it by the mere mention of His name? When Peter said, 'In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth,' did it amount to a magical incantation? I cannot believe it. Rather it was the name of Jesus on the lips of Peter that had Divine potency. Peter was a particular kind of man. He had lived with Jesus. The spirit of the Master dwelt in him. Jesus Himself reached out towards this man through Peter. So that when Peter addressed him, he spoke with the living accents of Christ's tone. His voice vibrated with Christ's compassion. His offer of new life was Christ's offer.

To be sure, this experience can come in many ways, through the reading of the Bible, through the hushed worship of believers, through the silent appeal of an infant's eyes. In a myriad ways God offers Himself to men. But the way by which God has chosen most often to come into the hearts of men has been through the Christ-inspired man.

The new experience of God is pressing itself upon every man with whom a Christ-dedicated person comes into contact. Man's crying need is waiting to be met through such consecrated people. That is to say, that broken, aching, yearning men and women may be waiting upon us.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Sympathy

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., Th.M., GLASGOW

'Old cast clouts and old rotten rags.'—Jer 38^{11}.

It is an odd circumstance that, when negroes are mentioned in the Bible, it is nearly always favourably—Moses' wife, the Queen of Sheba, Philip's convert and the hero of this story of Jeremiah's rescue from the dungeon—Ebed-Melech. He was an Ethiopian and a eunuch, not a person of much consequence it might seem. His very name—servant of Melech—was a reproach. The butt of many a joke, he could have been excused if he had been bitter and cynical. No one certainly could have expected him, a heathen, to be particularly sympathetic to Jeremiah, the prophet of the God of Israel. But, as often since, the humanity of the heathen rebuked the coldness of heart of the faithful. Not only was Ebed-Melech moved to sympathy when Jeremiah was lowered into the miry dungeon, but he did something about it.

Greatly daring—for Zedekiah was a potentate of the Eastern pattern—he approached the King to plead for Jeremiah's life. His plea was granted and he hastened to hoist the prophet to safety. He took time only to draw from the storehouse a supply of 'old cast clouts and old rotten rags.' These he lowered by cords down to Jeremiah, saying, 'Put now these old cast clouts and rotten rags under thine armholes under the cords.' Was there ever a more exquisite thoughtfulness, a more complete identification with the predicaments and problems of another, a more perfect

illustration of the grace of sympathy? 'Feeling corresponding to that which another feels' is the dictionary definition of sympathy, but it is better defined by a story such as this, or by its New Testament correlate—the Parable of the Good Samaritan. To remember the unpopular prophet in his prison was much; to approach the King on his behalf was more. But what lifts this story out of the realm of the ordinary is the fact that this fat, black slave remembered the tear and pull of the ropes, and provided, to minimize the hurt, old cast clouts and old rotten rags.'

Let the text remind us of three things. (1) Of the usefulness of useless things. It is a lesson which we in Scotland are accused of having learned too well. It is certainly true that during the War most of us in this country found active pleasure in meeting the need to salvage everything that could be used. We enjoyed making apparently useless things, like old papers and bones, be of service. It is a lesson which the great industries have been quick to learn. Some of the most valuable products in factories and works are by-products; and out of industrial and especially out of atomic waste all sorts of useful and saleable products are now being made. It is a lesson we could have learned from God who never destroys anything that He has made; the dead leaves nourish the new growth, the broken twigs become the sparrow's home, everything, however insignificant, is used over and over again in the economy of God. Nothing is wasted or cast away. Our Lord was stating one of God's universal laws when He said 'Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost.' In the spiritual realm it is certainly true that God can make the apparently useless, useful. Once, by chance, a very distinguished Scottish preacher, now dead, was in my congregation. Typically, it was on a Sunday when I had least reason for being satisfied with the sermon. Afterwards, with grave courtesy, he thanked me. 'Now, now,' I said, 'you know perfectly well, sir, that that was a miserable rag of a sermon.' He thought for a moment. Honesty triumphed and he said, 'Yes, I suppose it was, but'—and here he brightened—'God can use even rags, you know.' And God can. That is why you and I can hope to be of service to Him. He has showed us the usefulness to Him of that which the world calls useless.

He has also showed us (2) the bigness of little things. A letter, a handclasp, a child's smile can do marvellous things for us, can change despair into hope. A nod from a doctor after an examination, a quick glance from understanding eyes, the merest movement of a hand can make all the difference in our lives.

All the time it was of the little things that Christ spoke. He saw them as charged with the most profound spiritual significance—a lost sheep, a lost coin, a fallen sparrow, a widow's mite, a kiss of welcome. A cup of cold water, He said, if it be really cold and not the tepid fluid which has been lying at the tent door, speaks eloquently of love. When at last Christ sought to give men proof and token of the huge tenderness of God, it was a scrap of bread He took, a sip of wine and a few drops of water. Ever since these little things have spoken of His limitless grace. So Jeremiah knew of Ebed-Melech's real affection for him, when he saw 'the old cast clouts and old rotten rags.'

He knew then the bigness of some little things, and (3) the loveliness of unlovely things. A town recently was threatened with disease of epidemic proportions because of the lack of those most unlovely of all unlovely things—garbage carts. The dustmen were on strike. When they returned to work, they were more welcome than the most elegant of their fellow-citizens. Nobody could describe a dentist's chair as beautiful but we have all been very glad to see it when we were in pain. Equally certainly Jeremiah would be glad indeed to see the old cast clouts and old rotten rags, unsavoury though they might be, for they spelt safe deliverance for him.

All through His earthly life Christ saw beauty and goodness where no other could, and when He rode into Jerusalem to die, it was upon an ass, surely one of the least lovely of God's creatures. So, too, St. Paul said, 'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen.' All of which is only another way of saying that God has chosen the way of the Cross. The Cross was not a thing of beauty. Nowadays we make them of gold and silver and precious stones, but the first was of wood, rough-hewn, and of nails. It was a gallows, a common gibbet, disgusting and horrible. But the Cross is the centre and symbol of our holy faith for it tells of the fathomless love of God.

As we remember that and let some of God's love invade our pride-guarded hearts, we, too, shall find ourselves used, as was this negro of the long ago, who served God and his brother with 'old cast clouts and old rotten rags.'

Expository Problems

The Law and the Gospel

By Principal C. Leslie Mitton, Ph.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham

Jesus said: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil.'—Mt 5^{17} (R.V.).

The Moral Law has been an acknowledged reality in human experience ever since men have been able to reflect on their own nature. A stern sense of 'ought' lays its insistent demand upon man's conscience. Often among religious people the origin of this sense of obligation has been ascribed to God. Duty has been called 'stern daughter of the voice of God,' and man's awareness of his 'duty' has been interpreted as his recognition of the claims of God upon his life. But even those who have had no clear faith in God have nevertheless acknowledged an inner constraint to do the right, as they understand the right, and they came to call it 'The Law of Nature,' since they understood it as a law built into the very fabric of the universe, and so into the very constitution of their own human lives, as part of that universe.

Cicero described this 'Law of Nature' in these words: 'There is a true law, agreeable to Nature, diffused among all men, constant, eternal, which calls us to duty and deters us from wrong. . . . This law admits neither of alteration nor subtraction nor abrogation. The vote of neither senate nor people can discharge us from our obligation to obey it. . . . There is one law that embraces all races over all time, eternal and immortal. . . . If anyone obeys it not, he shall play false to himself and do despite to the nature of man.'

This belief came to be incorporated into the theology of the Christian Church and Thomas Aquinas wrote of it: 'That participation in the Eternal Law which is to be found in a rational being is called "Natural Law".' There are, however, some exponents of so-called modern Biblical Theology who have questioned the very existence of this Natural Law or dismiss it as something largely irrelevant for Christian Theology. Yet this is not in accordance with the teaching of the Bible, because in the Bible the recognition of the Natural Law in man is unmistakably present. C. H. Dodd has convincingly presented the evidence for this in his essay on 'Natural Law in the New Testament' (in his book, *New Testament Studies*, 129–142).

There is the 'natural religion' of the address attributed to Paul at Athens in Ac 17^{22-31}, but more reliably Pauline are some actual passages from his own letters. For instance, in Ro 12^{17} he advocates that Christians should practise 'conduct which shall be honourable in the sight of all men,' thereby acknowledging that 'all men' can recognize what is honourable. (Similarly in 1 P 2^{12} and 3^{16} the good conduct of Christians is expected to shame those who defame them, the implication being that even the heathen are capable of sound moral judgment.) Still more explicitly Paul writes in Ro 1^{19-21} and Ro 2^{14-15} of pagans who know God, even though they fail to honour Him, and of others who lack the advantage of a written Law but nevertheless show by their good conduct that they reverence an 'inner moral law.' In Jn 1^{9} also the eternal Word of God is equated with the 'light which lighteth *every* man that cometh into the world.' No man is wholly bereft of 'light.' Jesus, too, in His parables makes His appeal to this inner light in His hearers: 'How think ye?' He asks (Mt 18^{12} 21^{28}), and in Lk 12^{57} He expressly inquires: 'Why do ye not even of yourselves judge what is right?' He appeals to something within men which is capable of recognizing what is good and right when it is clearly set before them.

Men living together in communities compare their own moral insights with one another, and so there come to be agreed standards of appropriate conduct, unwritten codes of behaviour by which the members of the community are expected to order their lives. At a later stage, in societies where the people become literate, these standards of required behaviour are recorded as written laws.

A community law tends, however, to be a compromise between what the men of keenest insight see to be right, and what is practicable for the majority or enforceable in the society. Such law, therefore, is an accommodation of what is ideally right to what is practically attainable. When the law is written down, it has the advantage that the standard becomes objective and verifiable in cases of dispute. On the other hand it tends to become rigid and incapable of improvement. Moreover what was at first required as a basic minimum, below which a man's conduct must not fall, may come to be regarded as a maximum

beyond which he need not aspire. It is then that men of sensitive conscience are needed to challenge the written law in the name of the perfect law, of which a man may learn direct from God in the silent places of his own conscience.

The written Law became for the Jews an outstanding feature of their religion. It was claimed to represent the commands of God, as Moses heard them and transcribed them. The process may indeed have begun with Moses, but almost certainly the written Law was successively modified as prophet after prophet called it to the bar of the judgment of God's true commands, as He had revealed them to their inner awareness. It was the great glory of the Hebrew faith that it was the men of God who demanded this ever-increasing standard of moral conduct in the name of God. In some other faiths it was left to self-declared atheists (as, for instance, Lucretius at Rome) to denounce the depraved standards of conduct which went uncondemned by the polytheistic religion of the day.

At the time of Jesus, however, Jewish orthodoxy made the mistake of supposing that their written Law was now complete, a perfect record of the will of God for man. Indeed it may well have been the nearest of all written legal codes of that day to a true interpretation of God's commands. In fact, however, it was far from perfect. Along with undoubtedly true commands of God it included some that misrepresented God's will, and others which fell short of His perfect will.

This imperfect Law was what Jesus came to fulfil, to make perfect, and in order to do so He had to set forth the true Law of God, as it was struggling to find perfect expression through this imperfect medium. Because He refused to accept the existing Law as completely beyond criticism, He was regarded as an iconoclast, bent on destroying what was precious and sacred. His fearless recognition of the inadequacies of the Mosaic Law, His impatience with the restrictions of Sabbath observance, and His disregard of the rules about ritual defilement and about 'clean' and 'unclean' food, all gave the impression that He was wantonly ignoring the Law and undermining its authority. The Mosaic Law, as it stood, was indeed being shown to be unsatisfactory, but the true Law of God, only partially represented in the Mosaic Law, was being set forth in its perfection, and Jesus was showing how the Mosaic Law could be adapted so as to declare the complete will of God for man. In this way Christ aimed to fulfil the Law. If anything was discarded in the process, it was only imperfect items which were not part of the perfect Law of God.

He came, therefore, to fulfil the Law of God, and achieved this purpose in three ways: in His teaching; in His own life; and in the new righteousness which He made possible in the lives of His disciples.

(1) *Fulfilment through the Teaching of Jesus.* He fulfilled the Law by eliminating what was transitory and incomplete, and replacing it by words which expressed the eternal and perfect will of God.

(*a*) He insisted on making a clear distinction between the words of the Law and the explanations and applications of them in the teachings of the Rabbis. These were often accorded the same reverence as the Law itself. Jesus, however, characterized them as 'traditions of men' (Mt 15^6, Mk 7^5) and refused to reverence them as words of God. He honoured the Sabbath and kept it holy. It was a day appointed of God for man's good (Mk 2^{27}), a day when not only masters may rest, but servants also (Dt 5^{14}). But the multifarious restrictions imposed by the Rabbis He denounced as man-made distortions.

(*b*) He fearlessly rejected items in the Law which did not truly represent the will of God. Moses, for instance, had allowed a man to divorce his wife if he found 'any shameful thing' in her. Jesus declared outright that this permission was not what God ordained, but what Moses inserted 'for the hardness of men's hearts' (Mk 10^5). Similarly He discarded all regulations about forbidden foods. These prohibitions were human perversions of what God intended. God certainly forbids that which defiles human life, but it is not that which a man takes into his body which defiles, but the corruption in his heart which betrays itself in evil words and actions. Speaking thus, says Mark (7^{19}), He made all foods 'clean.'

(*c*) There were other commands in the Law which in their origin reflected God's will because they represented a moral advance on what they superseded; but instead of moving still further forward to their goal they had become static, and unfulfilled. For instance, to restrict vengeance to 'an eye for an eye,' instead of allowing it to multiply in degree with each act of retaliation, was a good thing, but to regard it as a counsel of perfection was quite wrong. Within God's perfect will there is no place for retaliation at all. We are asked to 'do good to them that hate' us (Lk 6^{27}).

It was a good thing also to love one's neighbour, but a bad thing when it came to be assumed that one's neighbour was the only person one needed to love, and when the scope of what was meant by 'neighbour' was limited to a very small group. Jesus enlarged the meaning of the word 'neighbour' to include all our fellow-men, and extended the command to love to include even our enemies.

It is a good thing to insist that a solemn oath must be kept, but a bad thing when it leads to the corollary that a promise without an oath need not be kept. Jesus insisted that our merest word should be as binding as the most solemn oath.

(*d*) Moreover, Jesus fulfilled the Law by requiring that it be applied not only to outward acts and spoken words, but also to inner feelings and desires. Resentment, as well as the act of revenge, is contrary to the will of God, hate as well as murder, and lust as well as adultery.

For the Early Church these 'fulfilments' of the older Law were accepted as rules of ultimate authority. Where Paul could quote a saying of Jesus, relevant to a disputed issue, further discussion was unnecessary (1 Co 7^{10}). Even where the words of Jesus are not precisely quoted, the authority of what they said is clearly visible. Romans 12, 1 Co 13, Col 3, for example, plead for the same quality of Christian character as we find pictured in the words of Jesus, and the fact that His precise words are not quoted makes the reflection of His teaching even more convincing than a merely mechanical repetition of exact words could have done. 1 Peter and James also faithfully reproduce the standards of conduct which Jesus commended.

(2) *Fulfilment in the Character and Life of Jesus.* Besides fulfilling the Law of God in His teaching Jesus also fulfilled it in what He was and what He did. He came to do the will of God (Jn 5^{30}, He 10^{9}, Mk 14^{36}), and in His conduct He illustrated what He advocated in His words. Though His followers were well aware of the high standards which His teaching set, yet, remembering His earthly life, they declared it to be 'without sin.' Nor was His goodness a merely negative avoidance of evil. It was positive goodness. He practised mercy and compassion, as 'He went about doing good,' and challenged evil even though it brought upon Him the murderous hatred of powerful enemies. He not only taught love of neighbour, but also showed its meaning in daily life by His own bearing towards outcasts and foreigners. He earned the name 'friend of publicans and sinners,' and fearlessly befriended hated Samaritans and despised foreigners. His cleansing of the Temple shows boldness in claiming for God what belonged to God, but it was also an act in which He championed the cause of dispossessed foreigners against the powerful rulers of His own people, for the outer court of the Temple where the market was held was the only part of the Temple into which a Gentile might go.

His own life proclaimed His devotion to 'justice, mercy and faithfulness,' 'the weightier matters of law' whose absence from the religious practice of the Pharisees He so greatly deplored (Mt 23^{23}).

What Jesus had been became the new Law for Christians. Regard and devotion to this loved Person took the place of reluctant obedience to impersonal rules. He is frankly spoken of as the 'example' of Christian living (1 P 2^{12}, Jn 13^{15}). Paul, too, acknowledged that Jesus was the standard of His daily conduct, when he confessed himself an 'imitator of Christ' (1 Co 11^{1}, 1 Th 1^{6}). In Him His followers saw what human life had been meant to be in the purpose of God. God had made man to be in 'his own image.' Man had failed to fulfil that purpose, but Jesus proved Himself 'the image of God' (He 1^{3}, Col 1^{15}).

When Paul speaks of 'the law of Christ' as that which Christians are called upon to fulfil (Gal 6^{2}), he most probably had in mind what Christ was, as well as what He taught. When he confesses himself as ἔννομος Χριστοῦ (1 Co 9^{21}, 'under the law of Christ' R.S.V.) we may be sure that it was devoted obedience to a person that he meant, not to a new list of rules. Indeed its meaning is hardly to be distinguished from his declared aim 'to be well-pleasing unto him' (2 Co 5^{9}).

The same truth is proclaimed in another way by John. One of the meanings which the 'Word of God' may bear is that of 'The Law of God.' According to Jn 1^{14} that 'Word' became flesh and dwelt among us in the human life of Jesus of Nazareth. To quote C. H. Dodd: 'The Word became flesh. In Christ, therefore, man is confronted with that Word, Wisdom or Law which is the law of his creation, the same which was partially disclosed to Israel in the Torah, and is known in some measure to all mankind, through conscience and reason, as the Law of Nature' (*New Testament Studies*, 142).

(3) *Fulfilment in the Obedience of Believers.* The Law of God is there for men to obey. Its real fulfilment, therefore, lies not in a clearer exposition of its meaning, nor even in one unique life of perfect obedience. Its true fulfilment should be found in man's obedience to it. Man's continued failure to live by God's Law was man's supreme tragedy. One supreme purpose of the coming of Christ to earth, of His death and resurrection, was to make available to men and women a new power for righteousness. He came to save men from sin into righteousness. He died that the New Covenant of *willing* obedience might be established in the lives of His followers, that they might be enabled 'to love that which God commanded' and so to live happily in obedience to the command. As the hymn declares, Christ saves not only from the guilt of past sin, but also from the present power of sin, as it threatens our lives day by day. He is of sin the 'double cure.'

Theologians differ in their emphasis at this

point. Some insist that Christ came to save 'from' sin, not 'in' or 'in spite of' sin. Others shrink from this confident affirmation, fearing that even if it were true, the deep corruption of man's nature would merely make of the achievement a further cause for arrogant pride, the worst of all sins. They argue that the grace of Christ 'is primarily the assurance of Divine mercy for a persistent sinfulness which men never overcome completely.' It is not 'primarily a power for righteousness which so heals the sinful heart that henceforth it is able to fulfil the law of love' (Reinhold Niebuhr). But it is both—an assurance of forgiveness to all who are penitent, and also an inward power that overcomes evil and establishes good, perhaps not completely, but nevertheless effectively.

It seems curious that this should be disputed by those who claim to base their arguments on the word of Scripture, because it is implied constantly throughout the New Testament, and is explicitly stated by the Apostle Paul, whose writings are sometimes quoted to the opposite effect. In Ro 8^4 he says that God sent His Son 'that the ordinance of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit'; and in Ro 8^{29} he says that believers are 'foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn of many brethren.' Our Lord constantly insists that it is obedience of life rather than confession of the lips which counts with God (Mt 7^{15-27}).

It is not that human nature is cleansed from even the possibility of sin. It is rather that a new power from God has come which can restrain and counter our continuing wickedness, so that it no longer rules our lives. Just as insulin, properly administered, can enable a diabetic to live a normal life, in spite of his persisting illness, so the grace of Christ and His gift of the Spirit, received moment by moment, can counter the moral illness from which we all suffer, and make possible 'normal health.' This, however, is no ground for pride. The sinfulness remains, and if a man for one moment ceases to rely in utter dependence on Christ, it reasserts itself in active sinning. But there is from Christ that which can defeat sin, not only theoretically in the theory of the Atonement, but practically on the battlefield of human life. It is possible, in spite of his corrupt nature, for man to become through Christ the man God asks him to be, or at any rate to make progress towards becoming such a man. This is an integral part of the gospel of the grace of Christ. As Augustine said so well: 'The Law was given that Grace might be sought. Grace was given that the Law might be fulfilled.'

Indeed, the greatest achievement of Jesus Christ is not that He taught men the perfect will of God, nor yet that He exhibited it in His own life and death, but that He made possible for men a personal relationship with God from which Divine power could flow into human life and change its innate selfishness and pride into humble and loving obedience to God, and sincere and practical love for one's fellow man. And in such conduct He told us is fulfilled the whole law and the prophets' (Mt 22^{40}).

In Defence of Q

By E. L. Bradby, M.A., Principal of St. Paul's College, Cheltenham

Dr. Austin Farrer's stimulating essay, 'On Dispensing with Q' in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, edited by Professor D. E. Nineham [1955], must have sent many of us back to the Gospels eager to test his hypothesis against that which we have grown to regard as traditional. Dr. Farrer, it will be remembered, challenges the view that the writers of the First and Third Gospels both used a common source in addition to using the Gospel according to St. Mark, and seeks to establish instead that St. Luke had available and used as the basis of his Gospel both the Gospel according to St. Mark and that according to St. Matthew.

To deal fully with this contention would require the re-examination of a whole mass of books and articles based on the 'two-document' theory—or later elaborations of it—and written over a period of more than half a century past. It is to be hoped that scholars who are qualified to do so will be provoked into making such a re-examination on a proper scale; but it will take time.

The purpose of the present article is to suggest a rough-and-ready method of judging Dr. Farrer's hypothesis without waiting for such a complete survey. It will be argued that the new theory can fairly be judged by reference to quite a small number of key-passages, in which all three of the Synoptic Gospels treat the same material, passages to which, remarkably enough, Dr. Farrer makes no reference at all in his essay.

For Dr. Farrer argues mainly from certain passages which are common to Matthew and Luke. He suggests, with great dialectical skill, that Luke

has rearranged the material that he found in Matthew in the interests of clearer and more forceful presentation, grouping, for example, two passages about prayer which in Matthew were separate. But these facts may equally well be explained by suggesting that Luke found the passages linked in Q and preserved Q's order, whereas Matthew split them up, in accordance with his characteristic thematic treatment (abundantly shown already by his treatment of Markan material). Such passages can therefore be used to support either side of the argument, and cannot be conclusive.

Surely the hope of conclusive evidence must lie in the passages where all three of the Synoptic Gospels treat the same material. Now there are certain of such passages where the treatment is so nearly identical in all three Gospels that nothing can be deduced regarding priority. Such a passage is the call of Matthew (Mk 2^{13-17}, Mt 9^{9-13}, Lk 5^{27-32}). Granted that Luke had Mark in front of him when he wrote there is no means of telling whether he also had Matthew, for Matthew is virtually identical with Mark.[1]

Another type of passage from which no conclusion can be drawn is represented by the account of the Transfiguration (Mk 9^{2-13}, Mt 17^{1-13}, Lk 9^{28-36}). Here Luke is shorter than Matthew and Mark, and they are almost identical with each other. It is therefore arguable that Luke abbreviated either Mark or Matthew, or both.

What we want is obviously a passage where all three writers are in parallel but Matthew is *fuller* than Mark. Then we shall surely find, if Dr. Farrer is right, some instances where Luke has reproduced material from Matthew which neither of them can have got from Mark, because it is not in Mark.

Luckily we have several suitable sets of passages, and four of them will now be considered.

1. *The walk through the cornfields and its sequel* (Mk 2^{23}–3^{6}, Mt 12^{1-21}, Lk 6^{1-11}). Here Matthew has clearly followed Mark very closely, but has characteristically inserted some additional material in three places: *vv.* 5–7 (an elaboration of the argument about the priests in the Temple, capped by another saying of Jesus and a quotation from the Old Testament); *vv.* 11–13 (parabolic allusion to a sheep fallen into a pit, with another saying of Jesus); and *vv.* 15–21 (which completes the narrative by informing us that Jesus withdrew and charged the crowds not to make Him known, this being capped by another Old Testament quotation).

Now if we read Luke's account we find that he has followed Mark almost verbatim; but of Matthew's insertions there is not so much as a trace. It is, of course, understandable that Luke should omit the Old Testament references; but if he had Matthew in front of him as well as Mark, and might therefore have copied the passage equally well from either, it is surely surprising that he did not think fit to reproduce here *any* of Matthew's additions, which were closely bound into the narrative, and which preserved two of the actual sayings of Jesus, sayings not reproduced elsewhere in Luke.[2]

2. *The Parable of the Sower* (Mk 4^{1-20}, Mt 13^{1-23}, Lk 8^{4-15}). Here again, all three Gospels give most of the material in almost identical form. But in *v.* 12 and from *v.* 14 to *v.* 17 Matthew is alone, *i.e.* he has inserted two passages into Mark's account. Of these passages there is again no trace whatever in the parallel passage from Luke.

Let us look at the Matthæan insertions in detail: the first (Mt 13^{12}) is the familiar saying of Jesus, 'whosoever hath, to him shall be given,' etc. Now this occurs in *two* other contexts in Luke: (1) Lk 8^{18}. This is only a few verses later than the Parable of the Sower, but interestingly enough it is in a Markan passage *not* reproduced by Matthew but reproduced in full by Luke, namely, the short Parable of the Candle under a bushel. (2) Lk 19^{26}, where it forms the conclusion of the Parable of the Pounds, being paralleled by a second occurrence in Matthew (Mt 25^{29}) at the end of the corresponding Parable of the Talents.

A second saying comes at Mt 13^{16-17}: 'But blessed are your eyes, for they see,' etc. This Luke introduces at 10^{23}, in his account of the return of the seventy disciples.

Between these two sayings of Jesus, Matthew gives an expanded version of the reference to Isaiah (given shortly in Mk 4^{12} and Lk 8^{10}), with a longer quotation. Luke's omission of this passage is less remarkable, for he might well have considered it as of less interest to his Gentile readers.

What is the upshot of all this? Simply that Luke is clearly following Mark and not Matthew in his account of the Parable of the Sower, although this involves him (according to Dr. Farrer's hypothesis) in leaving aside two important sayings which Matthew incorporates into this parable and bringing them in *later*. Surely here if anywhere he might have followed Matthew, since he intended to introduce the two sayings: to suggest that he changed their context for literary reasons seems far-fetched: is it not much more likely that—not

[1] It is, however, noteworthy that Luke follows Mark in using the name 'Levi' and not the First Gospel's 'Matthew.'

[2] 'In this place is one greater than the temple' (Mt 12^{6}); and 'It is lawful to do well on the sabbath days' (Mt 12^{12}). The omission of the parable of the sheep in the pit in this context is in itself striking, but it might be argued that Luke has changed it into the closely similar parable of the ox or ass at Lk 14^{5}.

having Matthew before him—he did not know of them as part of this parable ?

3. *The Charge to the Apostles* (Mk 6^{7-11}, Mt 10^{1-42}, Lk 9^{1-5}). Here Matthew's account is much fuller than Mark's or Luke's. All three accounts start off with almost identical wording.[1] Luke is a little shorter than Mark, not because he has omitted anything essential, but because he has summarized Mark's account. By the end of *v.* 5 Luke has reached the same point in the narrative as Mark at *v.* 11a : ' shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them.'

Now Matthew's much fuller version is also following Mark, with additional material interspersed. Thus he has reached the injunction about shaking the dust off at *v.* 14. He follows this up—again transcribing Mark—by the saying ' It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.' There Mark's account had ended. But Matthew adds a further long passage, starting with ' Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves ' (*v.* 16), and ending at *v.* 42. This passage consists of a considerable number of sayings, very various in kind, but obviously brought together here because of their reference to the rigours of discipleship.

Luke includes none of these sayings in his account of the charge to the Twelve, but at 10^{1-16} he gives an account of *another* charge, to seventy disciples (an incident not mentioned in Mark or Matthew), and in this charge he incorporates much of the material contained in Mt 10^{1-42}. Some of it repeats in fuller form material that he has already used in relation to the sending of the Twelve, for example, ' carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes ' (Lk 10^{4} ; cf. 9^{3}) ; ' even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you ' (Lk 10^{11} ; cf. 9^{5}). But it also contains fresh material closely resembling items in Matthew's account of the sending of the Twelve. Thus Luke's ' If the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it ' (10^{6}) recalls Matthew's ' If the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it ' (10^{13}) ; and Matthew's ' sheep in the midst of wolves ' (10^{16}) appears as ' I send you forth as lambs among wolves ' (Lk 10^{3}).

The passages would repay more detailed study than can be given here ; but enough has been said to show the problem which confronts us. On the old hypothesis of Q there was no difficulty : Luke, 9^{1-5}, was following Mk 6^{7-11}, which was the only source he had about the sending out of the Twelve. But Q had another passage, giving a similar, but longer, charge, referred to a different occasion, namely, the sending out of the Seventy. Luke has reproduced this fairly fully as a separate incident at 10^{1-16}, but Matthew has conflated the Q passage with the Markan one, giving one long charge to the Twelve instead of a short one to the Twelve and a longer one to the Seventy. But on Dr. Farrer's hypothesis what has happened ? Presumably this, that Luke, coming to the incident of Christ's charge to the twelve apostles, finding Mt 10^{1-42} too long for the movement of his narrative, and preferring Mark's shorter version (6^{7-11}), has given a short version at 9^{1-5} ; but, not wanting to lose the valuable sayings given in Mt 10^{16-42}, he has transferred them to *another* incident, although this was not referred to either in Mark or in Matthew (did he invent the incident or did he know of it from some other source ?). On this new incident Luke has lavished, we must suppose, many (but not all) of the sayings which his source Matthew had attributed to the earlier incident, together with a few others (for example, ' the harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few,' 10^{2}) which he has lifted from other Matthaean contexts (cf. Mt 9^{37}).

Can this be justified as an economical explanation of the facts ?

4. *Peter's Confession at Cæsarea Philippi* (Mk 8^{27}–9^{1}, Mt 16^{13-28}, Lk 9^{18-27}). The first four verses in Mark (*vv.* 27–30) are reproduced in closely similar words and almost identical length in Matthew (*vv.* 13–16. 20) and Luke (*vv.* 18–21). But between the last two verses Matthew has inserted a passage of great importance, in which Jesus gives St. Peter His special charge as the ' rock ' on which He will build His Church. This is not in either Mark or Luke, either here or elsewhere. During the rest of this narrative Matthew is following Mark very closely : Luke also follows Mark (or Matthew ?) closely where he treads at all, but he has entirely omitted the incident of Peter's rebuke. His omission of this incident is surprising in itself (though not, of course, inexplicable) ; the degree of surprise must be considerably heightened if we suppose that he rejected it in spite of its inclusion in almost identical form by *two* sources, both of which were before him (Mk 8^{32-33}, Mt 16^{22-23}). Once again there is nothing to suggest that Luke is following Matthew, and a certain amount which suggests that he is following Mark without knowing of Matthew's additions.

Other instances could be given, though the ones quoted appear to be the most striking. In the last resort Dr. Farrer's thesis cannot be ' proved ' or ' disproved,' at least in the present state of our documentation. (Supporters of the historicity of Q may, however, legitimately hope that excavations will yet present the world with at least some fragments of it.) Our view of the matter must

[1] Leaving aside the list of apostles, which Matthew gives between *vv.* 1 and 5, but which Mark and Luke have introduced earlier in the narrative (Mk 3^{16-19}, Lk 6^{14-16}).

therefore depend on the results of careful reading of the Gospels, helped by whatever imagination and literary insight we can bring to bear. We may be encouraged in this task by reflecting that these are the very qualities which Dr. Farrer has often commended, and by which much of his own work is guided (see, for example, *A Study in St. Mark*, 9).

If St. Luke had Matthew as well as Mark before him when he wrote, we can picture him following Mark verbatim whenever he had him, and Matthew verbatim when he had not Mark. But what, then, would happen when he had rival versions of an incident from Mark and from Matthew ? What we should normally expect any conscientious historian to do is to take the later and fuller version, in this case Matthew (since *ex hypothesei* Luke knew as well as we do that Matthew had incorporated Mark's shorter Gospel in his longer one). We might, however, concede that for certain literary reasons he might follow sometimes one and sometimes the other. But if we find, as we have found in four important passages, that the later and fuller version is consistently spurned in favour of the earlier and shorter, and that there is not one clear instance in these sections of any non-Markan passage which Luke has derived from Matthew, we can hardly be blamed if we fall back, with relief, on the alternative hypothesis, that in many passages Luke has used Mark and in many others Luke and Matthew have each used a common source other than Mark, *i.e.* Q.

Recent Foreign Theology

Judas Iscariot. The history of interpretation is a fascinating study, though the history of the interpretation of Judas Iscariot is less rewarding than that of some other Biblical questions might be. This is the theme of a study by Dr. K. Lüthi, who reviews the thought on Judas from the Reformation to the present day.[1] This is a careful and exact piece of scholarship, covering a great many authors, and all is well documented with full reference to the sources. Dr. Lüthi begins with the Reformers, and after dealing with writers who represented Lutheran and Reformed orthodoxy he passes to the Pietists and the *Aufklärung*, and then surveys the modern period from the Rationalists to the Form Critics, finishing with recent writers, such as Bultmann, Barth, Goguel and others. An appendix deals very briefly with the figure of Judas in post-Tridentine Catholicism and in Modern Judaism. While the question of the historical reliability of the story of Judas is necessarily involved, and writers who regard it as a later legend, and the story of the betrayal as unhistorical, are dealt with, much more important are the theological questions raised by the story, and the widely varied reflections on these questions tell us more about the theologians of the Protestant churches than about Judas.

Ezekiel. Another series of German commentaries on the Old Testament has been in progress for more than twenty years. This is the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, edited by O. Eissfeldt. In this series the Book of Ezekiel was handled by the late Professor A. Bertholet, in 1936, but Kurt Galling contributed the commentary on Ezk 40–42, 43^{10-17}. A number of out of print volumes of this series have recently been issued in revised form. In the present case, however, the earlier volume has been replaced by a new work, prepared by G. Fohrer.[1] Galling again supplies the commentary on the chapters he dealt with earlier, save that his contribution now ends with Ezk 43^{27}. The new commentary differs very considerably from Bertholet's, not merely in details, but in its whole view of the composition of the Book of Ezekiel. It is also nearly a hundred pages longer than its predecessor. No book of the Old Testament has given rise to a greater ferment of opinion in recent years than this Book, and it is interesting to find that Fohrer holds to the view of the date and location of Ezekiel's ministry that was usual before the ferment of the last thirty years. The amount of material which Fohrer discards as secondary is very much smaller than many writers have held. Yet it is not by ignoring their work that the author maintains his positions. He is fully acquainted with the considerable literature on the subject, and he has provided a thoroughly reliable and up-to-date commentary. He offers a translation of the Book, in which the verses held to be secondary are clearly distinguished from the rest in type, and beneath the rendering there are full text-critical notes, as well as an extensive commentary.

Dutch One Volume Commentary. With the issue of Parts 17–19, the one volume commentary on the Bible in Dutch, prepared under the editorship of the late J. A. vor der Hake, and written by a team of well-known Dutch Protestant scholars, reaches

[1] *Judas Iskarioth in der Geschichte der Auslegung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* [1955]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich ; Fr. 12.

[2] *Ezechiel* [1955] ; Mohr, Tübingen ; DM. 20.80.

its end.[1] These parts contain the conclusion of J. H. Stelma's commentary on the Fourth Gospel, and the commentaries on the remaining books of the New Testament. By far the greater part of these sections comes from the pens of W. C. van Unnik and J. de Zwaan, who are easily the two best Protestant New Testament scholars in Holland, and both of whom have reputations extending far beyond their own country. Van Unnik is responsible for Acts, James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation, while de Zwaan is responsible for all the Pauline Epistles. The remaining books, Hebrews and the Johannine Epistles, were entrusted to Stelma. In this commentary the Bible text is not printed, but the Dutch reader is given reliable guidance in brief compass on the problems attaching to the study of these books by men who are in touch with modern work inside and outside their own country, and who are sober in judgment. The whole work runs to twelve hundred and thirty-five pages, printed in double columns.

The Concept of Truth. A Dutch monograph addresses itself to Pilate's question, 'What is truth?' The author is Dr. J. H. Vrielink, and his work is entitled *The Concept of Truth*.[2] He begins by taking a number of representative Western thinkers and analysing their idea of truth. The authors selected are Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Kant, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and Heidegger. He next turns to analyse the Biblical concepts represented by the words אֱמֶת and ἀλήθεια. He rightly argues that in Biblical thought truth is not something merely cognitive, but then goes on to argue that the word אֱמֶת is connected with the idea of firmness, in the sense of being together, and from this the author passes on to link it with the idea of covenant. It is true that one aspect of truth lies in loyalty to covenant, but the fundamental idea of the root is reliability, rather than getting together. A true witness (עֵד אֱמֶת) is not one who is loyal to his group or to a covenant, but one who gives testimony that can be relied on. Dr. Vrielink then proceeds to his formulation of the concept of truth in terms of systematic theology, and because he bases himself on his erroneous philology he reaches the conclusion that the essence of truth in the theological sense is to be found in 'meeting,' in the meeting of God and man in Christ and in the communication of self by Christ. This is all highly questionable. The doctrine of the Incarnation is not 'true' because it is a doctrine of 'meeting,' or the doctrine of the incarnations of the Buddha would have to be pronounced equally true. Dr. Vrielink criticises the view of Brunner, whose shortcoming is attributed to the fact that he neglects the exegetical analysis of the Biblical words. His own analysis would seem to be too superficial to sustain his conclusions.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[1] *Commentaar op de Heilige Schrift* [1956]. Paris, Amsterdam; Fl. 1·50 each part.

[2] *Het Waarheidsbegrip* [1956]. Callenbach, Nijkerk; Fl. 7·50.

Entre Nous

A Theologian's Odyssey

Charm is an elusive and an indefinable quality; but although one cannot impale charm upon a definition, one immediately recognizes it whenever one finds it. And seldom can there have been a more charming autobiography than Nathaniel Micklem's *The Box and the Puppets* (Bles; 13s. 6d. net). Dr. Micklem writes with an enviable lightness and certainty of touch. In his day he has been the centre of many a storm; and in his Preface he writes: 'Some of my memories, I dare say, are inaccurate, though not intentionally, and some of my judgments are foolish, but my passage has been stormy at times, and as Heine said, "when a man has been guillotined several times in his youth, like Charles Nodier, it is quite natural that in his old age he should have no head."'

Dr. Micklem began with the advantage of a good home, and notably long-lived parents. Of his father he writes: 'He treated his sons like princes. He spoke but rarely of religion. It was said of a certain lover that, even when he was silent, he was eloquent of his beloved (*dum tacet hanc loquitur*). My father's witness was in character, action, and judgment, not normally in word.' He went on to the advantage of being at school at Rugby, where he must have been a rather unusual scholar, for, when his master asked what the Greek word *hybris* meant, he answered at once 'wanton antinomianism,' an answer which the master years later still remembered—and no wonder! He studied in Germany and had the privilege of listening to Wilhelm Herrmann. 'We used to say it was worth going to Marburg to hear Herrmann say, *der lebendige Gott*, for he really did believe in the living God.'

Dr. Micklem was a student at Oxford, where he failed to gain the academic distinctions he might have gained, but learned many other not unuseful things. Then on to Mansfield. J. Vernon Bartlet was then teaching Church History. He was 'the supreme master of periphrasis.' Dr. Micklem tells of Vernon Bartlet on the tennis court saying: 'You shall strike the ball to me, and I will strike the ball to you—but not contentiously,' when what he meant was: 'Let's have a knock up!' It was a curious time in theology. 'Our theology by all modern standards was imperfect; we were rejoicing in our relatively recent deliverance from old Calvinist dogma and were less interested in dogmatic theology than in the discovery of how little one might believe without ceasing to be a Christian.'

Later life was to bring Dr. Micklem into close touch with many great men and many great causes. He writes of Bernard Manning: 'In *extempore* prayer he had a mysterious *charisma* of the Spirit. It was as if he were praying all the time, and when he spoke his prayer aloud, it was but a continuation of his constant communion with a heavenly world.' Schweitzer he found the most unassuming and brotherly of men. 'After some long discussion of his views upon the Gospels I once asked him in what sort of form he would express his faith. The Lord's Prayer, he answered, expressed his creed.'

There is a surprising reminiscence of John Hutton, the famous editor of the *British Weekly*, who claimed to have preached one of the most politically effective sermons in history. 'He was a powerful preacher and believed that one of his sermons was at the very least a contributory cause to the Locarno Treaty. The story as he told it to me was this: the Cabinet, pro-French but aware that the country was increasingly dissatisfied with the pro-French policy, and having six weeks before anything need be done, put all their papers before Sir Cecil Hurst, adviser to the Foreign Office, and bade him offer them advice. Hurst weighed up the pros and cons and could come to no conclusion. On the Monday he must report. On the Sunday in despair he went to hear Hutton at Westminster Chapel. Hutton preached on Samson who, being tormented beyond endurance and being in touch with the elemental forces that stayed the whole edifice in which he was confined, uttered a great cry to the God of his youth and brought down the whole building in destruction. He then pointed to Germany, provoked nearly beyond endurance, no people so near to elemental forces; unless we change our treatment of her, he commented, she will slay herself and all of us. Hurst left before the benediction, said Hutton, and reported in two lines, "We must offer the hand to Germany, and must do it at once." The advice was accepted and Locarno followed. I naturally cannot confirm the story but cite it for the warning or encouragement of all preachers.'

This book is full of quotable things. There was the comment of the judge who, being pressed by his chaplain for a judgment upon the Assize Sermon which the latter had preached, observed that 'it was a divine sermon, for it was like the peace of God which passeth all understanding, and, like His mercy seemed to endure for ever.' There was the alleged motto of a certain Women's College in America: 'Pep without Purpose is Piffle.'

There is only one page of this book which we most heartily regret. There is a sneering parody by Russell Maltby on the hymn, 'Just as I am, young, strong and free,' which should certainly have been consigned to the oblivion which it deserves and not perpetuated in print. It was worse than a mistake to quote it.

In the last line of p. 24 *aterwards* should be *afterwards*, and in the eighth line of p. 75 *studus* should be *studiis*.

This is not only a charming book, it is also a most important book for Dr. Micklem was involved in many events which made ecclesiastical and political history. He who reads it will find entertainment and instruction most admirably combined.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

In the August number a new series will start. Articles already arranged are François de Sales' *The Devout Life* (the Dean of Chester); Augustine's *Confessions* (Canon Lionel du Toit), Law's *Serious Call* (the Reverend William Purcell); Law's *Spirit of Love* and *Spirit of Prayer* (the Sub-Warden of Lee Abbey, H. Leslie Sutton); Dame Julian's *Revelations of Divine Love* (the Reverend Dennis Lant); Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ* (Dr. Olive Wyon); Dr. Nels Ferré will write on a modern devotional work—Thomas Kelly's *Testament Devotion*. Pastoral classics on which articles will appear soon are Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* (Principal J. T. Wilkinson); Oman's *Concerning the Ministry* (Dr. G. Johnstone Jeffrey) and Herbert's *Country Parson* (Principal C. L. Mitton).

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.